BLM LIBRARY
88081952
RECEIVED
JUL 22
STATE OFFICE
BUR. OF LAND MGMT.
SACRAMENTO, CALIF.

CALIFORNIA STATE OFFICE
CENTRAL LIBRARY COPY

BOX 1

PROCEEDINGS

NATIONAL ADVISORY BOARD COUNCIL

TWENTY - FIFTH ANNUAL MEETING

March 22 - 24, 1965

Washington, D. C

Route		Initial	Date
1	SD		
2	ASD		
	RUS		
	ADMIN		
	R & F		
	L & M		
	PLANS		
	ENGR		
	LO		
	DM		

ACTION BY
RET. TO CENTRAL FILES
ROUTE AND DISCARD

BLM Library
Denver Federal Center
Bldg. 85, OC-521
P.O. Box 25047
Denver, CO 80225

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
STEWART L. UDALL, *Secretary*

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
Charles H. Stoddard, *Director*

HD
241
.A25
1965

#57511734 ID:88081952
CALIFORNIA STATE OFFICE
CENTRAL LIBRARY COPY
HD
241
.A25
1965

BLM Library
Denver Federal Center
Bldg. 85, OC-521
P.O. Box 25047
Denver, CO 80225

CONTENTS

	Page
General Statement	1
Attendance	2
Proceedings, Opening Session, March 22	6
Proceedings, Afternoon Session, March 22	7
Proceedings, Morning Session, March 23	8
Proceedings, Afternoon Session, March 23	11
Social Hour and Dinner, Evening, March 23	12
Proceedings, Morning Session, March 24	12
Proceedings, Executive Session, March 24	13
Certification	13

Statement of Senator Gordon Allott, Colorado...	Appendix No. 1
Statement of Senator Len B. Jordan, Idaho	Appendix No. 2
Statement of Senator Gale W. McGee, Wyoming ...	Appendix No. 3
Statement of Senator Wayne Morse, Oregon	Appendix No. 4
Statement of Representative Wayne N. Aspinall, Colorado	Appendix No. 5
Welcome and Keynote, Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior	Appendix No. 6
BLM Report, Charles H. Stoddard, Director, Bureau of Land Management	Appendix No. 7
Legislation Report, Jerry A. O'Callaghan, Chief, Office of Legislation and Cooperative Relations	Appendix No. 8

Proposed Criteria and Regulations, Robert L. Jones, Chief, Office of Program Development, and Irving Senzel, Chief, Division of Lands and Minerals Standards and Technology ..... Appendix No. 9

Exotic Big Game on Public Lands, Henry C. Gerber, Council Member, Oregon ..... Appendix No. 10

Range Management and Multiple Use, Glen D. Fulcher, Chief, Range Management ..... Appendix No. 11

Statement of John A. Carver, Jr., Under Secretary of the Interior ..... Appendix No. 12

Rest Rotation in Grazing Management, A. L. Hormay, Pacific Southwest Range and Forest Experiment Station ..... Appendix No. 13

Committee Membership Roster ..... Appendix No. 14

Recommendations of the National Advisory Board Council ..... Appendix No. 15

PROCEEDINGS
of the
NATIONAL ADVISORY BOARD COUNCIL
Twenty-fifth Annual Meeting
Washington, D. C.
March 22-24, 1965

The twenty-fifth annual meeting of the National Advisory Board Council was held in Washington, D. C., on March 22-24, 1965. Except for the executive session, all sessions were open to the public.

The morning of the first day was highlighted by the welcoming address of Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior. Charles H. Stoddard, Director, Bureau of Land Management, reported in detail on the progress and programs of the Bureau. Jerry A. O'Callaghan, Chief, Office of Legislation and Cooperative Relations, reported on pending legislation. James P. Beirne, Assistant Director for Administration reported on the Bureau's appropriation outlook. James E. Lee, Assistant Information Officer, narrated a slide showing on Job Corps activities.

Most of the afternoon of the first day was devoted to extensive discussion and consideration of the regulations and criteria proposed for implementing the Classification and Multiple Use Act and the Public Land Sale Act. The session concluded with a showing of slides depicting multiple uses of public lands in Montana.

The morning of the second day was devoted to discussion and consideration of: (1) district organization, consolidation of districts, and consolidation of district advisory boards; (2) proposed revised procedures for the election of district advisers; and (3) release of exotic mammals on public lands.

On the afternoon of the second day, John A. Carver, Jr., Under Secretary of the Interior, discussed subjects of mutual interest with the Council. Next, A. L. Hormay, Pacific Southwest Range and Forest Experiment Station, presented a slide illustrated talk on rest rotation systems of grazing management.

The morning of the third day was devoted entirely to consideration of topics of current interest by the Council's five standing committees.

The Council met in executive session on the afternoon of the third day. Upon the conclusion thereof, the Council adjourned at 3:50 p.m., Wednesday, March 24.

The meeting was attended by the following:

National Advisory Board Council Members - 1965

Alaska
Arthur J. Harris, state-wide

Arizona
Lee J. Esplin, cattle
Vard H. Heaton, sheep
Max T. Layton, wildlife
George Ricca, county government

California
Brunel Christensen, cattle
Murray Doyle, wildlife
Gerhard N. Rostvold, urban-suburban development

Colorado
Leonard Horn, cattle
Dan H. Hughes, sheep (chairman)
Edwin S. Hofmann, wildlife
Bruce Anderson, oil and gas

Idaho
Milton T. Jones, cattle
Ray Lincoln, sheep
Doyal Stiles, wildlife
Bruce Bowler, outdoor recreation

Montana
Gene J. Etchart, cattle
Paul G. Lose, sheep
Eldon Smith, wildlife
Arnold Bolle, forestry

Nevada
Fred Strosnider, cattle
George N. Swallow, sheep
Leonard Hoskins, wildlife

New Mexico
Alva D. Brownfield, cattle (Vice Chairman)
Floyd W. Lee, sheep
F. Louis Hernandez, wildlife
William A. Williams, Jr., soil conservation

Oregon
Henry C. Gerber, cattle
James S. Weber, sheep
Theodore R. Conn, wildlife
Lloyd Rea, county government

Utah

Kumen S. Gardner, cattle
M. V. Hatch, sheep
Othel L. Pay, wildlife
Edward W. Clyde, pertoleum

Washington

Francis A. LeSourd, state-wide

Wyoming

Robert V. Thompson, cattle
Joseph E. Donlin, sheep
Harold Evans, wildlife
James A. Whaley, soil and conservation

Department of the Interior

Office of the Secretary

Stewart L. Udall, Secretary
John A. Carver, Jr., Under Secretary
Karl S. Landstrom, Assistant to the Secretary
Robert K. Coate, Office of Assistant Secretary for Public Land Management

Office of the Solicitor

Thomas J. Cavanaugh, Associate Solicitor, Division of Public Lands
Joseph H. Tudor, Assistant Solicitor, Branch of Lands
Michael M. Hoch, Division of Public Lands
Patrick E. Katen, Division of Public Lands

Bureau of Land Management

Charles H. Stoddard, Director (co-chairman)
Harold R. Hochmuth, Associate Director
Robert E. Wolf, Assistant to the Director
Eugene V. Zumwalt, Assistant Director, Resource Management
Luther T. Hoffman, Assistant Director, Lands and Minerals
James P. Beirne, Assistant Director, Administration
Dan Saults, Information Officer
James Doyle, Chief, Office of Appeals and Hearings
Robert Jones, Chief, Office of Program Development
Jerry A. O'Callaghan, Chief, Office of Legislation and Cooperative Relations
and others of the Bureau's professional staff

Other bureaus and offices

E. Reeseman Fryer, Bureau of Indian Affairs
Frank C. Memmott, Bureau of Mines
Leon W. Duprey, Bureau of Mines
Gilbert G. Stamm, Bureau of Reclamation
John S. Gottschalk, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife

Representing private organizations, associations, and interest groups

Donald B. Alexander, American Planning and Civic Association
Harold W. Anway, Mutual Life Insurance Company of New York
Walter S. Boardman, The Nature Conservancy
Paul N. Carlin, National Association of Counties
Harry R. Carpenter, Kansas City Life Insurance Company
Louis S. Clapper, National Wildlife Federation
Marion Clawson, Resources for the Future
Milo H. Deming, American Society of Range Management
Wilbert P. Eggert, Prudential Insurance Company of America
Alfred G. Etter, Defenders of Wildlife
C. R. Gutermuth, Wildlife Management Institute
Eldon P. Harvey, New Mexico Cattlegrowers' Association
Carl J. Johnson, Soil Conservation Society of America
L. Dan Jones, Independent Petroleum Association of America
Bernard Klein, Institute of Public Administration, University of Michigan
Angus McDonald, National Farmers' Union
Clifford G. McIntire, American Farm Bureau Federation
C. W. McMillan, American National Cattlemen's Association
John J. Meehan, United States Chamber of Commerce
J. Kinney O'Rourke, The National League of Cities
J. Allen Overton, American Mining Congress
Joseph W. Penfold, The Izaak Walton League of America
Kenneth B. Pomeroy, American Forestry Association
Daniel A. Poole, Wildlife Management Institute
William I. Powell, Independent Petroleum Association of America
Frank W. Rogers, Western Oil and Gas Association
Kenneth J. Smithee, National Recreation Association
Robert L. Williams, American Institute of Planners

Members of Congress attending or represented at opening

Senator Wallace F. Bennett, Utah, represented by Miss Joyce Benson
Senator Paul J. Fannin, Arizona, represented by Jerry W. Poole
Senator Len B. Jordan, Idaho, represented by Edward Woozley

Members of Congress attending or represented at opening (continued)

Senator Frank E. Moss, Utah, represented by Grant Midgley
Senator Milward L. Simpson, Wyoming, represented by James G. Watt
Representative James F. Battin, Montana, represented by Jim Peterson
Representative Robert B. Duncan, Oregon, represented by Cliff Ouellette
Representative George V. Hansen, Idaho, represented by J. B. Thayn
Representative David S. King, Utah
Representative Ben Reifel, South Dakota, represented by Charles Fritzel
Representative John J. Rhodes, Arizona, represented by Miss Alma Alkire
Representative Henry P. Smith, III, New York

Members of Congress sending messages of greeting

Senator Gordon Allott, Colorado
Senator Wallace F. Bennett, Utah
Senator Alan Bible, Nevada
Senator Ernest Gruening, Alaska
Senator Len B. Jordan, Idaho
Senator Gale W. McGee, Wyoming
Senator Wayne Morse, Oregon
Senator Karl E. Mundt, South Dakota
Senator William Proxmire, Wisconsin

Representative Wayne N. Aspinall, Colorado
Representative Jeffery Cohelan, California
Representative Winfield K. Denton, Indiana
Representative Edith Green, Oregon
Representative George V. Hansen, Idaho
Representative David S. King, Utah
Representative John O. Marsh, Jr., Virginia
Representative Ed Reinecke, California
Representative Wendell Wyatt, Oregon

Proceedings, Opening Session, Monday, March 22

The first session of the 25th annual meeting of the National Advisory Board Council was called to order by Chairman Dan H. Hughes at 9:00 a.m. on Monday, March 22, 1965, in the auditorium of the Department of the Interior at Washington, D. C. Judge Hughes next turned the meeting over to Charles H. Stoddard, Director, Bureau of Land Management, who read the following delegation of authority:

> Pursuant to the regulations set forth in 43 CFR 4114.3-1, the Director, Bureau of Land Management, or his designee, is designated as the co-chairman of the National Advisory Board Council for its 25th Annual Meeting to be held in Washington, D. C., on March 22, 23, and 24, 1965.
>
> /s/ Stewart L. Udall
> Secretary of the Interior

Representative David S. King of Utah and Representative Henry P. Smith III of New York were introduced and expressed their greetings to the Council. Responses to invitations to Members of Congress to meet with the Council were read. Special messages were received from Senator Gordon Allott of Colorado, Senator Len B. Jordan of Idaho, Senator Gale W. McGee of Wyoming, Senator Wayne Morse of Oregon, and Representative Wayne N. Aspinall of Colorado; these messages are included as Appendix No. 1 through Appendix No. 5, inclusive to these proceedings.

Harold R. Hochmuth, Associate Director, Bureau of Land Management, introduced the officials of the Department of the Interior and the representatives of private organizations who were in attendance.

Next, Director Stoddard introduced Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior, who welcomed the Council to Washington, D. C., for its twenty-fifth annual meeting. Secretary Udall discussed some of the broad considerations in terms of policy problems with which the Council is concerned. These include items such as the Public Land Law Review Commission and the need for land law revision; the significant land legislation enacted by the 88th Congress; the Job Corps program and its relation to conservation of public land areas; the review of service and user fees charged by the Federal government; the expanding uses and values of the public lands. The text of Secretary Udall's welcoming and keynote address is included in its entirety as Appendix No. 6 to these proceedings.

After a brief recess, Director Charles H. Stoddard presented the Bureau of Land Management report, a comprehensive statement of the progress made since the last meeting of the Council, the major

problems with which the Bureau is currently faced, and the plans for future programs and actions. The full text of Director Stoddard's report appears as Appendix No. 7 to these proceedings.

Next, Jerry A. O'Callaghan, Chief, Office of Legislation and Cooperative Relations, reported on proposed and pending legislation concerned with the management of public lands and resources. A summary of Mr. O'Callaghan's report to the Council appears as Appendix No. 8 to these proceedings.

James P. Beirne, Assistant Director, Administration, Bureau of Land Management, then reported briefly to the Council on the outlook for appropriations for public land management. Mr. Beirne highlighted the major BLM programs for fiscal year 1967, indicating in which program areas increases might be expected and in which adjustments would probably be made.

Next, James E. Lee, Assistant Information Office, Bureau of Land Management, narrated a slide showing of Job Corps activities. Among other things, the slide showing depicted the story of a young man from his enrollment in the Job Corps at Baltimore, Maryland, through his processing and training, into his assignment on Operation Rehab in Oregon. In his narration, Mr. Lee described the Job Corps camps and centers which had been established, those under construction, and those planned; the kinds of training the enrollees would receive; and the conservation and improvement activities in which they would participate.

Whereupon the Council recessed at 12:01 p.m., to reconvene at 1:30 p.m. on the same day.

Proceedings, Afternoon Session, Monday, March 22

Judge Hughes opened the afternoon session at 1:30 p.m., following which approximately 45 minutes were devoted to questions, answers, and general discussion among the Council members and the Bureau staff relating to matters which had been covered in the morning session.

Following the discussion period, Robert L. Jones, Chief, Office of Program Development, and Irving Senzel, Chief, Division of Lands and Minerals, both Bureau of Land Management, outlined and briefly explained the criteria and regulations by which the Department of the Interior proposes to implement the Classification and Multiple Use Act (P.L. 88-607) and the Public Land Sale Act (P.L. 88-608). After presenting the criteria and regulations in brief, Messrs. Jones and Senzel moderated a discussion on the subject. The presentation and discussion of the proposed criteria and regulations are summarized as Appendix No. 9 to these proceedings.

Next, Mr. Joseph E. Townsend, Wildlife Management Biologist, Montana State Office, narrated a showing of slides which illustrated multiple uses on public lands in Montana, lands which preliminary review indicates should be retained for management. As well as compatible multiple uses, Mr. Townsend's presentation depicted some competing and conflicting uses and some areas which were suitable only for a single use. In addition, some of the slides reflected the effects of the unusually hard winter in Montana, particularly the antelope invasion of livestock feed supplies.

Whereupon the meeting was recessed at 5:00 p.m. to reconvene at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, March 23.

Proceedings, Morning Session, Tuesday, March 23

Judge Hughes called the Council to order at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, March 23, in Conference Room B of the Departmental Auditorium.

Immediately thereafter, Harold R. Hochmuth, Associate Director, Bureau of Land Management, assisted by Thomas H. Floyd, Chief, Branch of Organization and Management, presented and moderated discussion on the Bureau's proposals for district organization, consolidation of districts, and consolidation of advisory boards.

Mr. Hochmuth explained that the Bureau has been undergoing a comprehensive reorganization during the past year. He discussed some of the reasons for the reorganization, specifically referring to the new program direction that the Bureau has assumed in order to meet increasing demands on the public lands and to insure efficiency and economy. He noted that the Bureau is presently facing a real manpower squeeze as a result of the Government-wide economy efforts.

Details of the new district organization, presently being implemented throughout the Bureau, were discussed. The Associate Director explained that although the role and staffing pattern of the Bureau's district offices has changed considerably since they were established, little has been done to adjust basic structural arrangements and relationships. It was pointed out that present conditions demand that emphasis within the district office be directed away from a single use staff approach, which has generally been used by the Bureau, toward a coordinated staff effort based on comprehensive planning and multiple-use management. The Bureau is also attempting to get its operating people closer to the ground.

Mr. Hochmuth then explained the new district office structure which will be more or less standard throughout the Bureau. It is built around resource area managers who will have primary responsibility for the planning and execution of programs within specific geographic areas. Staff personnel at the district level will be grouped into a Resource

Management Staff, an Operations Staff, and and Administrative Staff. The duties of staff personnel and resource area managers were described and the working relationships within the district explained.

It was stressed that the new organization is designed to emphasize multi-resource management, better planning, location of personnel who make basic decisions and implement work close to the area of actual responsibility, improved contact with users, more responsiveness on the part of the Bureau to the needs and problems of users, and better cooperation with local groups. The new organization is also designed to improve the Bureau's internal communications and to provide a better career ladder for employee development.

Mr. Hochmuth next discussed district office headquarters consolidations and district administrative boundary adjustments. He pointed out that the Bureau is proposing to make boundary adjustments involving the St. George, Cedar City and Kanab districts in Utah and Arizona. In Colorado, the Durango and Montrose districts would be merged with district office headquarters located at Montrose and a sub-office at Durango. The Coeur d'Alene District Office and the Spokane Field Office are to be consolidated at Spokane with a sub-office remaining in Coeur d'Alene. In New Mexico, the Farmington and Albuquerque districts are to be consolidated at Albuquerque with a sub-office at Farmington. The Brigham City and Murray districts in Utah are to be merged and a new headquarters location established, perhaps at Tooele. Sub-offices for this district would be located at Randolph and Crouse Creek.

The reasoning behind these proposals was next reviewed by Mr. Hochmuth. He pointed out that the Bureau was making every effort to increase operating efficiency through better use of manpower and money, by improved utilization of equipment and office space, and through centralized administrative services. He went on to point out that the Bureau is trying to do this without placing additional burdens on users or decreasing the services the Bureau provides. He noted that the Bureau is also trying to promote greater self-sufficiency at the district level in order to allow for more full-time specialists to be on the ground and to otherwise strengthen technical competence. The consolidations will help the Bureau do this. The consolidations are also designed to reduce the span of control of intermediate offices and to decrease the need for large technical staffs at every intermediate office. Questions and comments from the board were discussed by Director Stoddard and Mr. Hochmuth as they related to the mergers and adjustments.

A discussion of grazing district advisory board mergers followed. Mr. Hochmuth explained that the Bureau has proposed merger of boards

in instances where there is more than one advisory board per administrative district office. It is felt that by merging boards that the stature of the board would be increased since they would be district-wide boards. Their contribution to proper management would also be more effective since they could deal with district problems and solutions. Communication between boards and Bureau personnel would also be improved and cooperation with local groups could be coordinated more effectively. Program coordination and planning could also be improved as could the Bureau's operating efficiency since much duplication of effort would be eliminated.

Mr. Hochmuth reviewed the proposed advisory board mergers. They are Arizona districts #2 and #3; Colorado districts #1 and #6, #3 and #4, and #5 and #8; Montana districts #2 and #3; New Mexico Districts #1 and #7 and #3 and #4; and Utah districts #1 and #2, #3 and #10, and #6 and #9. The mergers were discussed in detail and questions and comments from the group entertained. The discussion centered around specific aspects of the proposals and around the need to have a broader representation on the advisory boards. Various approaches were suggested by the Council. These included changes in the law to provide for a broader based board and/or special meetings to include representatives from all user and interest groups.

At the conclusion of the discussion, Judge Hughes called a recess.

After a brief recess, William L. Mathews, Resource Program Coordinator, Bureau of Land Management, discussed with the Council the most recent draft of the proposed revision of procedures for the election of grazing district advisers. All members were furnished with a copy of the draft for use in the discussion. Since the proposed revision had been reviewed extensively by all district advisory boards and several State advisory boards in the months preceding, Mr. Mathews generally limited his remarks to stressing substantive differences between the present procedures and those proposed. The only major objection to the proposed procedures was that the definition of "nominee" as set forth in Section 1, Definition of Terms; Qualifications Requirements, Paragraph A., Nominee, would work to exclude some competent sheep operators from advisory board membership because those operators also had as many or more cattle. Council members pointed out that knowledge and ability to serve as advisers are much more important than the class of livestock they raise; competent persons should not be barred from membership by rigid procedures solely because they engage in diversified ranching. Mr. Mathews reflected that the trend of converting from sheep to cattle and that of adding cattle to sheep in a ranch operation make it difficult to find qualified sheep men to serve on the boards -- perhaps the requirement that both classes of livestock be represented is an obsolete one, perhaps the district advisers should be livestock operators rather than sheep men and cattle men.

Following this discussion, the draft of the proposed procedures was further revised to remove the objection by adding the following sentence:

> "At the option of the District Manager following recommendation of the Advisory Board, precinct representation may be designated as being unclassified as to cattle or sheep."

Director Stoddard later indicated that the new revision would be referred to the Council for further review prior to adoption.

Since procedures for the election of grazing district advisers, including revisions thereof, are required to be published in the Federal Register, pursuant to 43 CFR 4114.1-2, and since all district advisers as well as members of the Council had previously been furnished with a draft copy of the proposed revision, the proposed revision of the procedures for the election of grazing district advisers is not made a part of these proceedings.

Next, Henry C. Gerber, Council member from Oregon and member of the Advisory Committee on the Release of Exotic Mammals on Public Lands, presented and discussed "Exotic Big Game on Public Lands," a report of study by Frank C. Craighead, Jr., President, Environmental Research Institute, and Raymond F. Dasmann, Chairman, Division of Natural Resources, Humboldt State College. This report in its entirety is included as Appendix No. 10 to these proceedings.

Whereupon, at 11:45 a.m., the Council recessed to reconvene at 12:55 p.m. on the same date.

Proceedings, Afternoon Session, Tuesday, March 23

The afternoon session opened with brief remarks by Glen D. Fulcher, Chief, Range Management Staff, Bureau of Land Management, concerning range management and how it fits in with other land management programs, particularly in view of the recent multiple use legislation. Mr. Fulcher's comments are summarized in Appendix No. 11 to these proceedings.

Next, John A. Carver, Jr., Under Secretary of the Interior, met with the Council in a working session. After presenting his remarks on topics of current mutual interest, Mr. Carver opened the discussion to questions and comments. Both the text of Mr. Carver's remarks and the transcript of the discussion which followed are included in these proceedings as Appendix No. 12.

Following, Mr. A. L. "Gus" Hormay, Pacific Southwest Range and Forest Experiment Station, presented an illustrated talk, supplemented with audience participation, on the subject of rest rotation in grazing management. Since it is not possible to reproduce Mr. Hormay's illustrated, audience participation presentation, Mr. Hormay has summarized his talk in a paper, covering the salient points discussed. His paper is included as Appendix No. 13 to these proceedings.

Social Hour and Dinner, Tuesday Evening, March 23

A social hour and dinner were held for the Council on the evening of Tuesday, March 23, beginning at 6:45 p.m. Highlighting the social hour, Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior presented Alva D. Brownfield, Dan H. Hughes, and Floyd W. Lee with special awards in recognition of their outstanding service as members of the Council for twenty-five consecutive years.

After dinner, Director Stoddard presented the Hon. Michael J. Kirwan, Member of Congress from Ohio, with a special book containing copies of the documents of the first public land surveys. Mr. Kirwan then talked briefly to Council members and guests concerning the complacent attitudes of the American people. Next, the Hon. Wayne N. Aspinall, Member of Congress from Colorado and Chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, spoke to the Council members and guests concerning the Public Land Law Review Commission. Neither Mr. Kirwan nor Mr. Aspinall spoke from prepared texts nor were their remarks recorded; therefore, their talks are not included as a part of these proceedings.

Later, Council members and guests viewed a documentary film on the Lewis and Clark expedition recently produced by NBC news.

Proceedings, Morning Session, Wednesday, March 24

The five standing committees of the National Advisory Board Council met from 9:00 a.m. until 12:00 noon on Wednesday, March 24. First, each committee selected a chairman and a vice chairman for the ensuing year. (Membership of the five committees appear as Appendix No. 14 to these proceedings.)

Next, each committee discussed and considered topics of current interest and formulated a report to the Council setting forth the committee's recommendations. (Committee reports are not included as a part of these proceedings, although the committee recommendations as adopted by the Council are set forth in Appendix No. 15 hereto.)

Proceedings, Executive Session, Wednesday, March 24

The Council reconvened in executive session at 1:30 p.m. on Wednesday, March 24.

As the first item of business, the Council voted unanimously to reelect Judge Dan H. Hughes as Chairman and Mr. A. D. Brownfield as Vice Chairman.

Next, the Council heard the reports of the five standing committees, adopting the report of each committee and acting on the committee's recommendations as its report was read. With the exception of one, all recommendations of the five committees were adopted by the Council, some with minor amendments.

A recommendation of the Public Use Committee to expand the interest representation on district advisory boards was declared tabled by the Chairman following a mixed but uncounted voice vote on a motion to table.

The Council then discussed and voted unanimously to advise that it did not wish at that time to take further formal action regarding the criteria and regulations proposed for implementing the Classification and Multiple Use Act and the Public Land Sale Act.

All recommendations adopted by the Council are set forth in their entirety as Appendix No. 15 to these proceedings.

The Council voted unanimously to extend, by letter to the Director, its appreciation to the employees of the Bureau of Land Management who were involved in arranging and conducting the meeting.

The Council voted to accept the invitation of Mr. Harris to hold its next meeting in Alaska, subject to Departmental approval.

Whereupon, at 3:50 p.m., the twenty-fifth annual meeting of the National Advisory Board Council was adjourned.

I certify that I attended the proceedings of the National Advisory Board Council herein reported and that these minutes are an accurate summary account of the matters discussed and the conclusions reached. The detailed proceedings of this meeting, including committee reports, are of record in this office where they may be examined by interested parties.

Charles H. Stoddard

May 20, 1965
Date

Charles H. Stoddard
Director, Bureau of Land Management
Co-Chairman
Washington, D. C.

MESSAGE FROM SENATOR GORDON ALLOTT
To the National Advisory Board Council, March 22, 1965

I wish to extend to the National Advisory Board Council for Public Lands my heartiest congratulations for your sustained and continuous service to our great country. This anniversary meeting is especially significant, since it marks a quarter-century of progress on an essential job. The Council deserves a "well done" from a grateful nation.

Regretfully, Senate commitments prevent me from joining you in celebrating this milestone in your history and from participating in the meeting. However, Mr. Charles Cook of my staff will be on hand as much as possible. From a review of the Tentative Agenda, this should prove to be a constructive and enjoyable three days, and I am confident that it will be a most successful meeting.

May I again extend my welcome to you, and my heartiest congratulations on this signal occasion.

MESSAGE FROM SENATOR LEN B. JORDAN
To the National Advisory Board Council, March 22, 1965

Dear Mr. Stoddard:

I extend my congratulations and best wishes to you and members of the National Advisory Board Council on the 25th Anniversary of the establishment of this Advisory Council. Some of the members here have served continuously since the National Council was organized.

The use, management and proper classification for disposition of certain of our public domain lands of the United States have made substantial progress in the last quarter of a century. Much of this credit is due to the outstanding contributions made by members of the advisory boards. When information was needed concerning use of these lands for grazing during the base period and when determinations concerning base properties were necessary members of the advisory boards furnished such information. They have been an important part in the operations of the Bureau of Land Management in keeping people in their communities advised of the total programs of lands, minerals, forestry, engineering and recreation as well as of grazing on public lands. Administrators and managers of the public domain have wisely used the judgment and experience of the Advisory Council Board members to solve difficult problems where cooperation of local landowners, state land managers and federal land agencies required coordinated action.

Those of us in Congress also rely on the good judgment of those of you on the local and national advisory boards and councils for advice and assistance in passing laws and in amending existing statutes so such laws are workable, practical, up-to-date and effective.

It is a real pleasure to have you visit us in Washington, D. C. May you enjoy your stay here.

MESSAGE FROM SENATOR GALE W. MCGEE
To the National Advisory Board Council, March 22, 1965

It is a real privilege to extend greetings to the National Advisory Board Council on the occasion of their 25th Anniversary Meeting.

No responsibility weighs more heavily upon government than that of fair and efficient management of the public domain. The Advisory Board has provided real service to the nation in helping us to live up to that responsibility. Its advice and council has helped provide the progressive stewardship over our public lands that has characterized our land management policies in recent years. The challenge we face now, to revitalize those public land resources which have been depleted through unwise usage, can and will be met, I am sure, through the precedents of public service and dedication to progress and equity that have been established in the work of the National Advisory Board Council.

I salute you on a remarkable past and anticipate an even more eventful and achievement-filled future.

MESSAGE OF SENATOR WAYNE L. MORSE
To the National Advisory Board Council, March 22, 1965

Mr. Chairman, Director Stoddard, Members of the National Advisory Board Council.

I regret very much that the press of business in the Senate makes it imperative that I attend to my responsibilities there, for I would very much like to be with your National Advisory Board Council and to sit in on your deliberations on conservation issues.

Over the last five years tremendous progress has been made and this can be attributed in a large measure to the broadening of the National Advisory Board Council. The 180,000,000 acres of public domain administered by the Bureau of Land Management throughout the West is of growing interest to everybody in the West. The fact that the Department of Interior now has a broader spectrum of public opinion before it as it considers the difficult land use and conservation issues confronting it in the management of these valuable public assets augurs well for all who depend upon the public lands for their livelihood. For it is through understanding, it is through knowledge, it is through the exchange of views, that progress can and will be made.

In 1962 a giant forward step was taken when the Congress authorized on my motion and with the cooperation of other stalwart conservation leaders in the Senate, such as Clinton Anderson, Senator Alan Bible, Frank Church, Senator Carl Hayden to advance conservation work in four key areas where erosion and the ravages of time had largely destroyed the ability of several million acres of public land to make their proper contribution to the economy of the West. In Southeastern Oregon the livestock economy dependent upon the public lands was threatened with obliteration with pending cuts in grazing use -- the watershed contributing silt to the downstream communities rather than pure water. The wildlife values were substantially missing in an area that could provide great hunting opportunities and the whole opportunity for outdoor recreation, a valuable economic asset in the West, was not being realized.

Heartening progress has been made and much more remains to be done.

This year a number of us in the Senate have joined together to advance again the cause of wise land stewardship. We have recommended to the Committee on Appropriations that an additional 500,000 acres a year of critical watershed lands be rehabilitated so that all of their values and all of their uses will be available to the people of the West. We propose that each district be given accelerated treatment which is so vitally needed now. We propose that the public land, which is largely rangeland, be in a position to make its maximum contribution not only to the livestock industry, but to all segments of the western economy. I know of no greater service in the public interest that can be undertaken in the field of conservation than to make these great watersheds truly serve the West.

I commend you as members of this Board for the wise counsel and assistance that you have provided. I commend the leadership in the Department of Interior and the Bureau of Land Management for the conscientious interest they have shown in forwarding needed conservation work. As always, I shall look forward to meeting with the members of the Oregon delegation who find time in their busy schedule to visit the Capitol.

MESSAGE FROM REPRESENTATIVE WAYNE N. ASPINALL
To the National Advisory Board Council, March 22, 1965

Dear Mr. Stoddard:

The work of the National Advisory Board Council has been of interest to me since it was established because I have always had faith that the users of the public lands could furnish significant advice to the Secretary of the Interior and the Director of the Bureau of Land Management and his predecessor in charge of the grazing service prior to consolidation with the Land Office. I therefore ask you to give my greetings and best wishes for the success of their meeting to the members of the Council, many of whom, including Chairman Dan Hughes, are old, close, and revered friends with whom I hope to have the opportunity to visit and exchange views when they are in town, even though I can not attend your opening session.

It is possible that the Committee's Consultant on Public Lands, Mr. Milton A. Pearl, may be able to attend and represent me at the meeting. But, if the Committee can not be represented I will appreciate it if you would pass on to the Council the expression of confidence that I have stated concerning their operations and, further, that I have the utmost confidence in an advisory board system that has its roots at the local level. The statutory District Advisory Boards provided for in the Taylor Grazing Act have, in my opinion, proven to be one of the most effective means of regulating the use of the Federal Range. I do not think there is any question but that the advisory boards, composed as they were of local stockmen from each district, were most instrumental in obtaining acceptance of the Taylor Grazing Act immediately after its enactment in 1934.

The expansion of the Advisory Board System through State and National Boards, has served to provide a channel through which Department officials at all levels may confer directly with representatives of the users. But, it is the District Advisory Boards that are chosen by the stockmen themselves and who speak most authoritatively for the grazers. It is for this reason that I was glad to see that, in your tentative agenda for the National Council meeting, you have included a discussion of "District organizations' consolidation of Districts; consolidation of District Advisory Boards." In considering these matters, I urge you and the members of the National Advisory Board Council to remember at all times that these District Boards represent

the stockmen and that to be effective they must be so located geographically as to permit ready and immediate access for those involved. The distances between the most remote parts of a District will readily indicate whether a consolidation of Districts, and, therefore, of District Advisory Boards, is going to defeat the very purpose for which Congress established the boards.

I am pleased to have had this opportunity to send my greetings and message to the Council.

WELCOME AND KEYNOTE
STEWARD L. UDALL, SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR
To the National Advisory Board Council, March 22, 1965

It is a pleasure to welcome you all here. I hope you have a lively, provocative, and productive session while you are here with us.

We are always glad to have our Advisory Boards ready and willing to give advice because our experience has been the more counsel we get the better.

The Director tells me this is the 25th Anniversary of the creation of the National Advisory Board Council. I think this makes this meeting particularly significant. I am also advised we have three charter members of the Council here who have managed to persist as Advisors for lo these 25 years. I want them to stand up. You all know them of course. I think they all deserve a special applause this morning.

Judge Dan Hughes; Floyd Lee, Alva D. Brownfield; let's give them a hand.

They have helped us pioneer in this whole field and have been looking over our shoulder with a good deal of success over the years.

I want to discuss a few of the broad considerations that we see today in terms of the policy problems which must be your paramount concern during your meeting here. I would like to say this period we have passed over in the last four years since some of us came into the picture has presented some tough problems but I think we have dealt with them successfully. I would like to hope that this Board is now functioning better and it has more influence within the Department, and I think this is the real measure, than it has had at any time within the past.

We face a very challenging future here with regard to several recent developments. I think all of us are going to follow the work of the Public Land Law Review Commission that the last Congress established with great interest. There are indications that the Commission is going to have its organization - - first organization - - step soon, and I think the relationship of this Board to the Commission will be an important factor in the picture.

Certainly, we have all realized, those in the Public Land Management business, that such a review is long overdue. We have such a mass of overlapping laws and statutes and regulations that this is a good time, I think, for us to have a big look at the national level in regard to this whole picture.

There are other developments, too, that are important. I think it is significant that we have a President now who himself is a rancher, a land user, and someone who is familiar with our public lands problems in the west.

I think it is also significant that the last Congress enacted many items of legislation that are going to have a tremendous significance in terms of the long term future of our land and people relationships in this country.

The Public Land Review Commission was one. The Wilderness Bill which has been enacted is another.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund Bill which we are in the process of implementing, getting it into action with the States since this is as much or more a State program as a Federal program is also important.

The new Wild Rivers concept President Johnson has put forward this year is equally interesting and important in terms of the future of the country. It may be that you will want to discuss this legislation.

Another new program that we have under way, and I hope in the long run is going to have a tremendous significance in terms of the conservation of our public land areas, is the Job Corps Program.

This program is moving forward slowly and deliberately, as I think it should. It is a big new program. I have participated in the dedication of some of the Job Corps recently. From what I see at the beginning, if we really make this program successful, if we get it off on the right foot, I think Congress will be coming back maybe a year from now, as they did with the Peace Corps Program, to double it or substantially enlarge it. It is our hope that these camps will not only be rehabilitation centers, educational centers for young men, but will enable us to tackle the big backlog of work in restoring and re-vegetating the public domain and tackling other conservation work that is needed on our public lands.

So this again is a favorable new factor in the picture.

There is one other thing I should mention this morning. This is an old subject and yet one that we always have to have on the agenda, but there are special reasons for having it up for discussion at this meeting.

The President has asked this Department, and all Departments, within the last 30 days to make a very searching and complete review of all user fees and all fees of all kinds within the entire Government. I was surprised, when this was discussed at a Cabinet meeting about a month ago, not only at the number of user fees charged by the various agencies and Departments of the Government, but at the amount of revenue received by the Federal Government as a result of all these fees -- everything from Customs fees to the passport fees to the fees that are paid for the various types of services.

This review is under way at the present time. It will be a review directed towards all of the fees that are charged for governmental service, in terms of determining those that should be eliminated, new ones imposed or those that should be changed to make them more equitable in terms of fees charged for similar services in other parts of the Government.

When President Johnson wants something done he wants it done in a very thorough way and this is under way at the present time. Therefore, the fee problem is again on our agenda and should be discussed as part of this general review in the months ahead.

During this period our public lands are of increasing importance to everyone. The interest of all of the user groups are intensified. None of us can duck the fact that our public lands are becoming more valuable.

They are becoming more valuable for grazing, for outdoor recreation, for minerals, for wildlife. All of these interests persistently assert themselves. Our job and your job is to balance these interests, to orchestrate them into a program that makes sense in terms of the total policy and welfare of the United States.

This means that our problem probably gets more complex and more subtle rather than simpler and easier. It means that your job is more important and that we need more advice rather than less in this important field.

So I am delighted to meet with you a few minutes this morning. I hope you have a successful meeting, and I hope to see some of you while you are here.

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT REPORT

Statement of Charles H. Stoddard, Director, Bureau of Land Management to the National Advisory Board Council
March 22, 1965

When we were setting up this meeting, my co-chairman, Judge Hughes, said that the trouble with this Board is that there is too much of the "Feds" being the teachers and the Board being the students. My inclination was to agree with him. After awhile, a teacher-student relationship can get tiresome; after 25 years, it is time for graduation, so we will call this a commencement ceremony.

I want to congratulate the three members of the Board who have been here from the beginning, as the Secretary did, and to again give recognition to Alva D. Brownfield, Judge Dan Hughes and Floyd Lee for their years of untiring service.

Now, we have been through a long period of adjustment on public lands since the enactment of the Taylor Grazing Act.

Advisory Boards at all three levels -- local, State and National -- were set up to provide a continuing source of advice on the problems which face us in the management of these lands. Just as we begin to get a problem solved, we find we have a couple more to take their place.

It is becoming a very, very difficult job to manage these lands, with all the varying interests that are developing in them. We can see the future of the National Advisory Board Council, on public land matters as one of increasing importance. It is going to broaden its scope beyond matters which have been its primary concern over the period of its history. But even now, as the Board is constituted, it can give the kind of counsel and guidance that we in the Department, in the Bureau particularly, need to have. For this reason, my report will touch on may things we have to deal with, and on how the Board can give even greater assistance.

We really need your help. We need your participation in the decision making process. Your job is to feed in to us the viewpoint of the people who are most affected by the management of the public lands.

Now we have new legislation which brings us to an important turning point in the development of public lands. Over the years, there has been constant uncertainty of management. This has been one of the major problems for administrators and users alike. The whole question is whether the land is going to be retained or disposed of; whether we are custodians or managers.

The result of this historic uncertainty has been, as far as the Bureau is concerned, to take up matters on a case by case basis, rather than to follow some broad policy guidelines and program system. But the legislation recently passed by Congress provides a real breakthrough.

The Public Land Law Review Commission to which the Secretary referred this morning, declares that the public lands of the United States shall be:

(a) retained and managed; or

(b) disposed of in a manner to provide maximum public benefit.

This clearcut development has been further amplified by the Classification and Multiple Use Act of 1964. For the first time, we can now develop some broad classifications and recommendations on which lands should probably move over into private ownership, and which should probably stay in public ownership.

This clarification of our mission is going to be very helpful, in that it will be possible to make Long-Range Management commitments, as well as needed investments. Our job now is to promulgate criteria for classification.

That bureaucratic phrasing means that we have to set up rules and regulations by which these lands shall be disposed of or retained. We are going to have a hearing on this next Thursday, at which Karl Landstrom will preside.

The proposed criteria are in your hands; they will be dealt with very thoroughly during the meeting. We want to get all your views because, you know, these are in a preliminary form which we hope to refine.

The Public Land Law Review Commission Act and the Classification and Multiple Use Act give first recognition that some of the public lands are to be retained in public ownership. Likewise, there are very definite areas that should not be retained in public ownership. For those retained for long term multiple-use management, 10 uses are set forth: livestock grazing; fish and wildlife development; industrial development; mineral production; occupancy; outdoor recreation; timber production; watershed protection; wilderness preservation; and other public lands values which might be lost if the lands passed out of public ownership.

To those of you who use the public lands, this multiple-use application is very important. You know well that disposition, and withdrawal for special use without multiple use, breaks the continuity of tenure, and impedes effective management. What I am saying is that now we have some assurance that lands will remain in Federal management, there is less likelihood of these lands passing into other ownership for other uses.

Contrary-wise, those lands classified for industrial, community expansion, which logically fit into the private sector, will be disposed of under a new system, which I will discuss in a minute.

This turning point, this major shift of our land policies, should be viewed with a little historic perspective.

The lands have served a very valuable purpose over the history of the United States. One of the first disposal provisions was to entice the Hessian Mercenaries -- you remember, the ones George Washington fought at Trenton -- to desert from the English Army. Later Congress made some land available for them in payment. Many of these men became settlers.

Then we paid public lands as a bounty to officers and men who fought in the Revolution.

We paid off the public debt of the Revolution with public lands.

Then the primary use became the promotion of settlement. The idea that every man has a right to own a piece of land, to make a living, was a primary concern of our country in its early days, and we developed generous sale and settlement laws, and gave generous land grants.

A more recent major use, this calling for retention of land in the public ownership, has been the establishment, by reservation, of the national parks, the national forests, the reclamation programs, power sites, national wildlife refuges, and national defense needs. And now a brand new development, national recreation areas.

I want to discuss this in a little more detail in a minute.

Still another purpose is making land available for exchange for some of the new national parks.

The whole problem, however, of what happens to the public domain land which is classified for multiple use management, is one which I think the Council should seriously consider.

Up until now, the Council's responsibilities have largely dealt with a dminishing public domain. Withdrawals, sales, transfer to the states and so forth have been reducing the domain for which the Bureau is responsible, and with which the National Advisory Board Council is concerned. But today there is a need for broader consideration of those lands which are, or will be under multiple use management.

The new national recreation areas, plus many of the game ranges, provide essentially for multiple-use, but I don't believe that the National Advisory Board Council has had the opportunity to give full consideration to the implications of those withdrawn for other primary uses.

I am bringing this question out because there is more and more pressure from recreationists, and conflict is developing between those lands which have primary recreation value, but also a potential for multiple-use, and those on which the multiple uses are relatively equal in importance. This subject is one, I hope, to which the Council will be able to give some more detailed consideration.

These and other problems in connection with the uses of these public lands have been piled up overtime, and we now need to get your direct help in reaching solutions.

We are going to try to identify them, as I say, in more detail at our meetings.

When I became BLM Director a year ago last June, it became apparent that one of the things that the Bureau needed, that public lands needed, was some sort of systematic inventory and classification. I asked the Secretary to give us a directive to begin some classification -- classification which would indicate where our blocked-up lands are, where the solid blocks are, where the intermingled lands are, where the various scattered lands are.

When you look over a map of the 12 western states you find that the public lands fall into these three major categories; that each of these is a different management responsibility; and that each is a different management problem.

So over the last year, we have undergone this analysis of the public lands. We come out with something like this: roughly 150 million acres are classified as blocked areas susceptible to multiple use management. This includes lands which are generally 80 percent or more in Federal ownership. These lands also, in some cases, lie near cities and towns where there would be disposal. But primarily, these are multiple use management lands.

In addition, there are about 22 million acres of fragmented and intermingled lands around these areas. These lands are a different management responsibility and there are several quite obvious ways to handle these lands.

Up until now, we handled them all about the same way; but in any sound system, as you men know, we have to tailor our management to fit the pattern of land ownership. So we are looking at these blocked areas -- these relatively solid blocked areas -- as lands on which we can handle the direct management. In other words, we invest more work and money and commitment, overtime, than on the other kinds of land. But in the intermingled land areas, where there is a heavy proportion of both Federal and private land, our approach must essentially involve cooperation with the landowners adjacent to us, and with the other public agencies working with those landowners.

Then we have a third program on fragmented lands which we cannot administer effectively or economically. These lands, plus those around cities and towns that lie in the path of expansion, we will classify for transfer. They are the most obvious lands to be transferred. We can see this pattern clearly.

We have had to apportion our work load relative to our land patterns; where we have a light land pattern, we have a light work load. We can better use our manpower in areas where we have heavier concentration of public land.

One of our problems, of course, has been that the public domain lands have never been clearly identified for public knowledge -- on maps, for example. We have our own internal maps, but one of the things that distinguishes land managment by other public agencies is that their lands have boundaries, names, signs, and can be identified on color maps. These are the conventional approaches to land management, and the fact that the public lands have never been adequately identified has always led to a great deal of public confusion. But when we get them on a map, and under classification, we'll be able to show clearly which lands are proposed for a multiple use management and which for disposal, as well as land in the cooperative management arrangement.

Now, of all the many land uses of recent years, the one getting the most publicity (and I personally think over-publicity) has been outdoor recreation.

I say over-publicity with all due respect for workers in that field -- but I am going to say it anyway. I think it has become a national fad like the yo-yo used to be.

Outdoor recreation -- we all like to go out hunting and fishing. More and more people will be going out from the cities. It is a fact of life. I don't think it is a matter for a lot of propoganda. But the fact that the public domain lands are being used for recreation is clear enough. We have a managment responsibility which is clear enough.

Now, how do we handle it? It is essentially managing people's use of the land, rather than cattle or something else. If we don't manage the recreational use, we get such problems as litter. I am sure all of you have seen it, particularly where people concentrate along rivers and streams and other attractive camping areas.

We either take care of this litter, or we let it accumulate and become a national disgrace.

Recreation also has an economic benefit to local communities. There is inadequate data on just what contribution tourists make when they come in, but we know the small town merchants are glad to get them, and this is strong evidence of the benefits from recreation.

This year, for the first time, we have a small appropriation for a minimal kind of recreation facility construction. This is essentially for camp-outs, camp sites, sanitation facilities, necessary supplies, waste disposal and so forth. Under this arrangement, we hope to concentrate the use of these lands in a way that will avoid abuse; and there has been abuse in the past; and a fire danger; and a pollution danger; and a danger from overcrowding that may result in outbreaks of illnesses. Under the program we have under way, nearly 20 sites have been located. We will soon have those on a map.

We are not sure how many more of these sites we will need. We have to gauge where the public use is, because this is an after-the-fact proposition. In each of the established areas, people are concentrating and using the lands. By steering people into just a few acres, we managed to get them off the extensive areas, and now we can manage them with some degree of certainty.

Well, now, I have referred to the old system, the traditional system of allocating the public lands: sale and disposal and withdrawal, with public domain lands as the residual. Let's consider further the change toward multiple use management.

Some withdrawn areas, areas that the Bureau of Reclamation and the Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife have withdrawn, were set aside as national recreation areas.

We face the responsibility -- and I think you gentlemen face it along with us -- of developing a coordinated multiple use management program. Recognizing that the national parks are out of this category (they are set up for a special purpose), the other lands which are withdrawn and will be withdrawn must be given serious consideration. How do we develop multiple use management, and how do we coordinate the Bureau of Land Management with these other Federal agencies?

There are two ways to go about it. The old way is to set up each agency as an independent unit in conflict with other agencies. Now there is an opportunity to go a new direction, which is to coordinate management through a departmental management program for all these lands, recognizing that some areas might have special uses. We may have to modify management to fit the special uses, but multiple use still may continue where it is not inconsistent with the special uses.

An example that comes to mind is the new Glen Canyon National Recreation Area proposal in southeastern Utah. The bill proposes certain boundaries. The boundaries are set forth by the Park Service and approved by the Secretary, and are fairly generous in that they include considerable scenic area adjacent to the reservoir. Now, we see no objection to this, providing there is provision for multiple use management.

There is, for example, a proposal for an extensive electric power generating facility. That plant will use water from the reservoir and the coal alongside it; but they are going to locate the plant far enough from the edge of the reservoir that it won't detract from the scenic values of the National Recreation Area itself.

Grazing can continue in these areas, providing we develop a management program consistent with the land's resources.

We must do soil conservation work on these lands.

We must make sure that fire protection is provided.

This means a degree of inter-agency cooperation which we have never really faced in the past.

When the Secretary made his decision on the boundaries of the National Recreation Area, he did so with a commitment that we would work out a much closer integration of the management programs of the Bureau of Land Management and the National Park Service in the Glen Canyon area. We are now trying to tie these management responsibilities together. This is a departmental concern, and I think the Department would appreciate guidance from this Council, because I am sure that many of

you are familiar with this problem and may be have actual use arrangements in and around these lands.

I don't mean only Glen Canyon, but withdrawn lands generally. Either the Department gets sound guidance from you, or it goes along on the basis of certain assumptions. There is a need for outside suggestions, opinions, and advice, because Bureaus tend to be units in themselves, and not to get the coordination that benefits the people outside.

Government is Government is Government. One agency has one job; another agency has another. So we are facing the problem now of really tying together land management responsibilities, and I would say that with this full thrust we can move toward intelligent, considerate multiple-use. Your help on this will be very useful in the months ahead, because I think we are hitting towards a show-down on this problem.

I will say that the Secretary is aware of it and he is, I think, open to suggestions on how we do it. The Committees will deal with this more precisely.

The potentials of public lands are dependent upon the spirit as well as the letter of the Classification Multiple Use Act. We need ways and means of identifying these multiple uses so that public lands no longer gravitate into special use areas requiring new and special regulations, when general rules for all public lands are fully adequate.

In other words, our problem is to maintain multiple use management and at the same time provide for these rather special or unique situations that are found in various places on the public lands.

I think that multiple-use gives us the answer, as long as we consider it from a flexible standpoint.

Now, as we move into the general program we are talking about, the advisory boards are going to be a key to success or failure.

We are past the period of the individual case load. Though we still have some left. The whole problem of adjudication is beginning to be less and obviously, less important. Grazing matters alone are not the primary concern of our advisory boards.

President Johnson last summer called for what he termed a "creative federalism", in which new concepts of cooperation between the National Capital and leaders of local communities are needed.

Now, an active role by the National Advisory Board Council, the State boards and the local boards, is one way of establishing a better cooperative reationship between your Federal government and the local

communities that are affected by it.

I think there has been too much of the attitude that Government is the big brother, or the enemy, of the people. Well, government is made up of people just like yourselves. We don't know all the answers. We know we have a lot of clumsy problems in administering anything as big as the public domain. We also know that we need help and advice, and for this reason we do look forward to a much closer working relationship with you.

For example, in developing our criteria for the multiple-use and of public sales regulations, we held 65 meetings all over the West with local groups -- over 3,000 people attending. This is what we want -- more and more local participation, so that the solutions we develop are ones which the local communites enter into and participate in. They may not like it; I don't think anybody can agree 100 percent on anything. If we did, we would not be people. That is what democracy is for, to provide opportunity for dissension, differences, minority opinions, and so forth. Yet we do have to make up our minds and act. We cannot debate forever, but I am sure that when we make up our minds to do something, our decision will be more effective, by getting local participation, by getting representation from all the people, rather than by operating alone.

A number of other issues are developing in the management of public lands.

The President's National Beauty Message has great impact, for example.

The size of the public lands alone makes it necessary for us to review the use of these lands. Where are we building our road?

Are we ruining the natural scenery where we are running power lines?

What is happening to litter?

A lot of these matters have been brought to our attention, and I don't think they require any immediate action, except to be included in consideration of management over the long run.

Another matter is the geophysical exploration crews that have been going over the land. We recently set up an arrangement whereby they must get a permit and work out a plan of operations. This has been done in other Federal ownerships. It has never been done on our public lands, but there has been too

much abuse of public lands by these exploration crews to allow this to continue. As responsible contractors and companies, these people are going to be expected to stick to the roads and to carry on their activities in such a way that the land will not be destroyed or harmed.

On coal and phosphate regulations, these expand the acreages that are going to be available for these minerals. We insisted that the regulations control surface disturbance so that there will be -- where there is strip mining and so forth -- backfilling and leveling and vegetation, and operators won't just go away and leave a waste.

In the same regulation, we hope to limit the amount of leasable coal and phosphate acreage to that which is needed for development, rather than hugh areas over a long period of time, where it could end up in a monopoly situation that excludes other potential developers.

Another matter of importance, which the Secretary touched on, is the Government-wide review of all user charges. In the directive from the President, he indicated that there were eight areas of consideration, only three of which BLM is directly concerned with: recreation use fees; oil and gas leasing; and grazing fees. These matters are going to be given considerable study -- they are under study now -- but no developments have taken place.

However, during your Committee meetings, I would like to have you give some consideration to this. We are going to ask one of the Committees to study the question over the next six months or so, and to give us some specific guide lines in late summer, perhaps.

These user charges will be government-wide. The Bureau is only one of a number of agencies of the Federal government involved in this; nevertheless, your advice will be much needed in arriving at some policy decisions on this.

We have had another series of directives from the White House with respect to economy and efficiency. In this light, we are going to have a special discussion on consolidation the organization of districts, which I know is on the top of many of your minds. We are going to, in this special presentation, make an analysis of how we have come up with certain proposals.

This is the only stage they are in now. I want you to be sure of this -- that we are having to look at workload with relation to land patterns. We cannot afford to keep districts going and fully manned on which our land basis is reduced. It is about that simple. We cannot keep on a lot of paper shuffling and record keeping when the workload or the actual production, does not justify it.

The whole question of the advisory board mergers comes into this consideration. We urge you to consider, as objectively as you can, the role of the local advisory boards and how can they function efficiently at the same time, review the present structure. We would like to have you examine our proposals for setting up our districts more on a staff basis.

Up until now, our districts have essentially been all staff. The District Manager has been the only one responsible for the whole area. We propose now to break this up so that there is a man that a user can go to, either in the district or located in one of the smaller towns, out in his area, who will be responsible for the decisions. You won't have to go running all the way to the District Office every time. We hope that better service can come out of this kind of an arrangement.

We want to get your suggestions and advice on this idea.

Thomas Jefferson, you know, said that the best fertilizer on a man's farm was the master's footsteps.

I think I used that before -- but the master, when he has three or four million acres in a district, well, he cannot leave very many footsteps. If we break these districts into manageable size units and put a man in charge there, he can be on the ground and available to help and to ramrod any road work; to pay closer attention to problems and coordinate the operations in that particular area. That would not be possible if he were just an engineer or a grazing man or a soil conservationist or a fire control man or some other specialist.

Well now, I might say that in this general look we are looking at the structure of the districts, we realize that some changes will be needed to fit the program changes I mentioned.

The whole question is that of cooperative relations with the Soil Conservation Districts and with the counties -- the two groups that can give considerable help in the future.

For example, areas we set up for disposal. The law says that the area must have a locally developed land use plan and zoning system. In other words, we cannot create any of these rural urban slums simply by unloading land; but the community has to operate its own plan. The National Association of County Officials is working with the counties very strongly, very hard. We are having a conference with them at the end of the month in Reno, Nevada, to go into this whole problem in much more detail.

Likewise, working with the Soil Conservation Districts. Now the districts traditionally have been set up to work with private landowners. They will continue to do so, but where we have this intermingled land pattern, we hope to get a joint conservation land use plan for the public and private lands, so we are working consistently with each other, with the adjacent private owner, to get a better use of the land in the long run.

Another program which is beginning to emerge is our restoration grazing and flexible management.

As we move toward indirect management, rotation grazing as a tool of grazing management becomes very desirable. I think those of you who have had a chance to really practice or observe it cannot help but agree that rotation grazing management stands up over a period of time much better than general, overall area grazing. And flexible management, whereby more responsibility is turned over to the user, where the user actually does the managing of the land -- Federal land as well as his own -- under prearranged management plan, is certaintly in the offing. The system of joint responsibility, whereby the Federal government is not out just to catch trespassers -- this sort of thing -- but is operating on a cooperative partnership basis, under a system of rules and regulations and a management plan means fewer of the punishment-oriented type of regulations, as someone called them.

Well, there are several other things.

We have another small, very small, program. The scientists have been interested in our reserving a few of the fragments of primitive, natural plant communities, and archeological situations, such as petrified wood, or early native prehistoric camp sites, or others.

These are the kinds of things we are beginning to put under protective withdrawal. We want to hold them in the status quo until we can see what would be the best long term arrangment.

In one situation, some great big petrified redwood logs in Nevada have had to be protected by a cyclone fence. We have had to do this in an area in Utah, too, because people who sell the stuff go in there and dynamite it and saw it up; either we put this kind of a situation under protection, or we stand to lose the whole thing. As I indicated, a number of such areas have been identified as having scientific value. They don't take up very large acreages of public land. In fact, they are very, very small, but their special values are great.

Another important issue is the Oil Shale Committee Report, which you may have read about. I think I indicated we identified about 150 million acres in the Western states for multiple-use; about 22 million acres in cooperative and fragmented areas; and about 11 million probably

suitable for disposal.

We calculated roughly that the 11 million acres was worth at least a billion dollars in present land values. That is a very conservative estimate. This looks like a lot of money, but compared to oil shale it's a trifle two trillion barrels, worth $300 billion dollars -- that is enough to pay off the national debt.

So when the Secretary appointed a special committee to study this problem, he was walking on eggs. The Committee also knew that it was walking on eggs. They had a split series of decisions or recommendations.

The basic issues are whether to lease now, or whether to lease sometime in the future when the country's oil supplies are in tighter supply; and whether the research should be carried on entirely by private people, or whether the Government should participate in the research, through the Saline Water Program, for example. The Committee split on these two major issues, so we don't expect any change. But those of you from northwestern Colorado, Utah and Wyoming, where the oil shale is found, will be interested in its report. I think it is important that all of you study over this report and give it your serious consideration because here again, it is a question of whether the Department is going to be getting advice from the Council, which is set up to give advice on public lands, or whether it is going to be open to every promoter pushing a policy for his own particular interest. I am not asking for a recommendation now, or in the immediate future. But I want to alert you that there will be a need for us to take a stand, or several stands, however you choose to do so.

Another matter is public access to public lands. I don't say is a problem coming up, necessarily, but it is a situation at present. It is one in which there has been a lot of name calling on both sides. There has also been a lot of common sense on both sides.

There is increasing awareness in southeastern Wyoming, for example, where we have had an arrangement whereby there is intermingling of public and private lands which is open to hunting.

Some State laws are relieving private landowners of legal responsibilities, but are not providing for maintenance of roads on private lands, or reimbursement where there is destruction of private lands by recreation users.

So we are not moving very quickly on this, but I do want you to be thinking about this issue.

In the next few months we are going to be trying to identify where there are good working relationships, and where some of the working relationships are broken down. We want to get together with the Council again for advice on the matter. I think that some kind of systematic arrangement might be desirable in the long run, rather than a deadlock and name calling arrangement that has existed in some areas.

I think all of you have seen the Leopold Report of the Committee that the Secretary appointed, and I won't need to go into that in any detail. But this is a matter of concern to some of you, and you may wish to express yourselves on that.

Likewise, the Job Corps, which the Secretary mentioned, is a new experiment as far as the Bureau of Land Management is concerned. We do expect to have more camps developing, and I think that we have plenty of backlog of work lined up for these boys to do.

We are hoping to get well-screened boys, who would be a credit to this program, and boys who will benefit by the work and education they get. We hope our camps don't become rehabilitation centers for fellows of pretty questionable backgrounds. It is up to the Office of Economic Opportunity to do the screening, and I think we are going to have to be fairly tough on some of the fellows that we take in under this program, if this screening job is not done well.

We opened our first camp at Tillamook on February 1, and 100 boys are there; and they have all started to work.

We have also had a rehabilitation program in Oregon, where we had the very serious floods. This set up crews of 20 men each to work out and clean up the debris in timberchoked streams, and to do road repair work. These boys will go into regular camps as soon as they have completed their assignments.

This about sums up my comments this morning.

I am sorry if I have run over, but a lot has happened in the past year.

I would like to wind up with one quote. At the time the Taylor Grazing Act was under consideration, in 1933, a Congressman, Burton French of Idaho, made this very sound observation. He said, "As I see it, however, the astounding value of the public domain lies in the uses that have been everlooked for the most part in discussions that have occured upon this subject. These uses are as watersheds;

and for the controls of stream flow; uses as deterrents to floods; uses for natural storage for irrigating lands; uses for game and for recreation; uses for forage and ranging; uses as forest area; and finally, uses as gigantic regulators of climatic conditions of interest alike to people under reclamation projects and in rainfall belts.

"Indeed, the values of these lands are such that the welfare and prosperity of the people of a mighty empire are dependent directly on the fidelity which the lands we call the public domain are administered."

Thank You.

LEGISLATION REPORT
Jerry A. O'Callaghan
Chief, Office of Legislation and Cooperative Relations
To the National Advisory Board Council
Washington, D. C., March 22, 1965

As you have had indications here, the Administration and the Department are not resting on their laurels in the Congress, either. The preceding 88th Congress has gone down in the books as the Conservation Congress. There is a fair cluster of Conservation Bills presently before the Congress, and receiving in some cases, fairly immediate attention.

One Bill that is fairly close to the end is the Water Resources Act. -- the Water Resources Planning Act. This was known in the last Congress as S-11. It has been switched over to HR-11 in the present Congress.

This Bill has passed the Senate and the hearings have been held in the House and the House has ordered it reported -- the House Committee has ordered it reported. The Bill touches on the Departmental planning that the Director mentioned here, earlier.

It is a device to provide a Water Resources Planning Council in the Federal Government; a Bill to provide in the field -- various river basins; Federal-State River Basin Commissions -- to do what is called comprehensive planning and our involvement in it comes from this phrasing of the proposed law; the standard term is Water Resources and Related Land Resources.

Now, they have only been working on this comprehensive approach to river basin planning since 1937 when they reported the Inland Water Ways Commission but there had been a legislative history gone forward with this Bill that relates such practices as the Bureau in the Department here, engaging in the land stabilization activity; prevention of erosion; and so on; and the general clutch of conservation practices is to be considered part of the related land resources, and is to get its place in this comprehensive river basin plan.

A second bill is the one the Secretary alluded to. It is the so-called Wild Rivers Bill, which was sent up as an Administration proposal very early in the month. In fact, it was not available in its printed copies until last Friday. It is being held up on the desk in the Senate for co-sponsors. This is a Bill that provides, in its main thrust, a finding that some of the free flowing rivers of the United States possess unique water conservation; scenic, fish, wildlife, and

outdoor recreation values of present and potential benefit to the American people, and then further provides that the policy to be complimented would preserve other selected rivers or sections thereof, in their free flowing condition, to protect the water quality of such rivers and to fulfill other vital national conservation purposes.

Then it makes the following declaration:

> "The following rivers are, by the Act, the enactment of the Bill, to be considered wild rivers:
>
> "The Salmon in Idaho which would be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture.
>
> "The Clear Water, the middle fork of the Clear Water in Idaho, also to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture.
>
> "The Rose River in Oregon, the administration of which would be jointly worked out between the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture."

(This, by the way, does not necessarily mean whole rivers. There are specified segments of them, but I am skipping over that in the interest here of time.)

> "The Rio Grande in New Mexico from the Colorado-New Mexico line, to the town of Pilar, to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior.
>
> "The Green in Wyoming from the Bridge of Wilderness to Horse Creek, with the administration to be worked out between the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior.
>
> "The Swanee down in Georgia and Florida with the Secretary of the Interior being given the administrative responsibility for that."

Then there is a list of nine other rivers, but the ones that have concern for us would be the Missouri in Montana; and these, by the terms of the Bill, are put down for Federal and State study, for their possible inclusion in this Wild River study.

The main thrust of this Bill is to withhold those rivers from dam construction, you know, to alter the very nature of the river -- and then to provide corridors holding the adjacent scenery for a half mile or a mile or so in as close proximity to the natural state as possible.

I regret to say I don't have the Bill number but I will get it for you very quickly. I have not handled any of the printed copies of it. That is what keeps it out of my memory here.

The Director suggested a series of national recreation bills. The one that is the furthest along in Congressional consideration is the Big Horn in Montana and Wyoming which has passed the Senate. It is now pending in the House Committee, and Members of Congress have introduced some of these and the Executive Branch are also sending up Executive Bills on some of these. Without going into the differentiation of where they are in the legislative process, I am just listing the possibilities here.

Besides Big Horn, there is Flaming Gorge in Utah, Whiskey Town in California -- there was a hearing on it last week -- and Glen Canyon in Utah.

These are bills that would create national recreation areas. While the bills vary in detail, the format is fairly general. They provide for a recognition of the recreation -- of the national recreation interests -- in certain specified areas, and other uses not incompatable with that use which is permitted and authorized; and the Secretary is given the authorities that are available to him elsewhere in the administration of these various resources.

The Bureau itself also has in various stages a series of Bills of recommendations. I will hurry through them rather quickly; not because they are not important, but because of our time limitation, and the fact that their importance comes out of their totality rather than any one individual bill.

One bill would seek to secure for the Secretary of the Interior some special land management authority for an area known as Kings Range in North Western California, which provide acquisition authority, authority for the Secretary to buy land and streamline the exchange authorities that are presently available to him.

The objective here would be to straighten out a situation of intermingled private and public land that is holding back the possibility of Federal investment in erosion control, improvement of grazing, and so on, and developing the recreation potential, and put this out as a possible demonstration area to show the Public Land Law Review Commission what can be done with an area of around 26,000 acres when the Secretary of the Interior has a full range of land management techniques at his disposal.

There is another draft bill dealing with the recording of mining claims. This is one of the amazing anomolies of the Public Land Law; but mining claims are registered in the County Courthouse. They are not registered in the Federal land offices; yet a mining claim is in the nature of an option; and what happens, it puts the land owner in the position -- the rather ridiculous position sometimes -- of dealing with land and not knowing whether there is an option out on it or not. But this bill would call for the recording within two years of the passage of the Act of any outstanding mining claims; the failure to record would be a forfeiture of the claim.

Then it would provide in the future -- 90 days, I think it is, after location -- that the claim would have to be filed with the land office or be forfeited.

We have a uniform timber trespass act. The Government relies on the local or the State statutes for the recovery of trespass damages and this has led us -- because of the difference in the State laws and so forth -- into a very hard hodgepodge of penalties, and so on, and what it does is put the Bureau in a bad position of maybe finding the same operator double damages in one State, and giving him triple damages in another State, in an absolutely identical situation.

The Bill is modeled on the Oregon Timber Trespass Law brought up to date with the latest case law.

Particularly in Florida, we have a situation where the reserved minerals are balking the intensive urban development. This is because down there phosphate -- the presence of phosphate -- has engendered a lot of little local bills and private bills; the Committee and the Departments are both tired of dealing with this on an individual case basis, and it looks as if we might get some action on this.

What this would do is where the mineral interests or where the mere presence, the actual presence of mineral is academic, where the United States owns the mineral rights, it would be possible to sell the mineral rights to the owner of these lands <u>if</u> the fact that the mineral rights are being reserved to the Government is forestalling urban development.

What has happened here is that as the urban-suburban development reaches out into these lands and the subdivision details are put together, everything goes along famously until the finance company lawyers discover that mineral reservation and they don't know what it is. It scares them out; so this will make it possible to sell the mineral interests.

We are also proposing again, as we did in the last Congress, an exchange bill -- a technical bill but, I think, a very important one. Its chief new addition would be to extend the Secretary's authority to exchange interest in land as well as land, and to make it possible for either party to an exchange to equalize by cash. This is to get around the impasse that sometimes builds up when the equal values don't equal out; there is no way of an individual putting up any more land to finish off the exchange, and it is just an impasse there in the present law. This would break the impasse by permitting the Secretary to accept cash and also permit him to give it if it is on his side of the deal.

There is another bill, not sponsored by the Department but endorsed by the Department, HR 398, which is a local bill, but I mentioned it here as a possible strong wind. It deals with four national forest in Colorado.

Under the present standing of the mining law and the withdrawal facts, the national forests are open for mineral exploration, mineral claims.

On the other hand, for administrative sites, recreation sites, to protect the government's interest in that, there is a very involved withdrawal process that withdraws them from the operation of the mining law. Well, this Bill is Mr. Aspinall's Bill; it goes back in to split the difference by permitting the mineral exploration and the mineral claims on these kinds of withdrawn lands but confining the patent to the mineral deposit itself, and not to the fee simple title, and the mineral exploration is to take place under regulations by the Secretary of Agriculture, with respect to the surface.

That, in a very quick capsule, is a rundown on the major items of this legislation.

PROPOSED CRITERIA AND REGULATIONS FOR IMPLEMENTING THE CLASSIFICATION AND MULTIPLE USE ACT AND THE PUBLIC LAND SALE ACT

A summary of presentation and discussion by Robert L. Jones, Chief, Office of Program Development, and Irving Senzel, Chief, Division of Lands and Minerals Standards and Technology.

The Classification and Multiple Use Act of September 19, 1964 (78 Stat. 986) authorizes the Secretary to (1) classify land for retention and usage for multiple use, and (2) classify for sale under the new Public Land Sale Act of September 19, 1964 (78 Stat. 988). The new Public Sale Act often authorizes sale of land so classified.

The classifications may also segregate the land against various forms of settlement, location, sale, selection, entry, lease, or other forms of disposal, including the mining and mineral leasing laws. Both acts are temporary and expire on June 30, 1969.

The proposed regulation is divided into several major sections:

Subpart 1725 - Program Policy

This portion sets forth general policy for the Bureau of Land Management for all land management and land transfer activities.

Part 2240 - Subpart 2243 - Public Sales

This portion includes procedural instructions for making sales under the Public Land Sale Act of 1964.

Subpart 2410 - Land Classification

This portion includes all criteria used by the Department in making classifications under all of the acts authorizing classification. It has been expanded to include criteria for the new act, and is further subdivided as follows:

2410.0-3 - lists authorities under which classifications can be made.

2410.1-1 - lists general criteria for all classifications.

2410.1-2 - lists more detailed criteria for retention classifications.

2410.1-3 - lists more detailed criteria for disposition classification.

2410.1-4 - lists criteria for segregation under cited classification authorities.

2411.1 - lists classification procedures.

Mr. Jones pointed out that the new authorities are supplemented to and do not supersede or otherwise modify any existing authorities.

He also pointed out that the classifications are for tenure - for retention or disposal, and not for use. Any change in the existing use arrangement, if appropriate, would have to be accomplished under existing use regulations, such as the Federal range code. There was considerable discussion over this point, and it was raised several times.

A number of questions were raised regarding the applicability of the Classification and Multiple Use Act, and were answered as follows:

1. The act does not apply to lands that are under withdrawal (other than the general orders of withdrawal).

2. Retention classifications can be made without segregation. The classification simply states that the land should stay in Federal ownership, under multiple use management. Such classification will often cover extensive areas. The segregation is added for limited areas, and as necessary, to protect the management program. In many cases where extensive retention classifications are made to implement multiple use, the land will be left open to certain types of petitions and locations so that small localized exceptions to the retention classification can be accommodated. In almost all cases, the land would be left open to mining location and mineral leasing, since these uses are part of multiple use.

A question was raised regarding the reservation of minerals under the new Public Sale Act. Mr. Senzel pointed out that the reservation was required by the act.

Mr. Senzel explained the Public Sale Act requirement for the existence of zoning regulations prior to sale of land. He also explained the working relationship the Bureau is developing with the National Association of Counties to encourage county governments to plan and zone in advance of development.

Considerable discussion centered around the depiction of groups and localities qualified to purchase land under the new sale act, with the conclusion that each questioned applicant would have to be scrutinized individually, and that it was difficult to be any more specific than the act itself.

A question arose regarding the effect of the new legislation and regulations on State water law. It was answered that the law and regulations had no effect on State water law.

Discussion developed relating to the definition and applicability of the phrase "American standard of living," in relation to agricultural entries. It was observed that this would be very difficult to apply, and it was agreed that a better criteria needed to be developed.

Mr. Senzel then explained the disposal criteria in detail. He explained the proposed system which, after land is considered proper for disposal, requires consideration of different forms of use and different means of disposal in a definite order or sequence.

An observation was made that the regulations seemed to favor retention, even to the detriment of expanding communities that needed land. Director Stoddard pointed out that this was certainly not the Bureau's intention, and that the Bureau strongly supported the new Public Sale Act.

BLM Library
Denver Federal Center
Bldg. 85, OC-521
P.O. Box 25047
Denver, CO 80225

EXOTIC BIG GAME ON PUBLIC LANDS

A report of study by
Frank C. Craighead, Jr.
President, Environmental Research Institute
and
Raymond F. Dasmann
Chairman, Division of Natural Resources
Humboldt State College
presented to the National Advisory Board Council, March 23
by Henry C. Gerber, Council Member from Oregon

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this report is to provide information for determining if, where, and under what conditions, exotic mammals, particularly big game species, should be released on public lands and to suggest guidelines for consideration in specific release proposals. The approach has been to analyze the effects and results of past introductions, to study and assess field conditions and to evaluate these on a basis of ecological knowledge and principles. The authors wish to acknowledge the contribution of numerous scientists and writers most of whom cannot be individually credited in a report of this kind (see bibliography). Thanks is also extended to Federal and State employees and to private individuals who generously provided information and facilities.

A rapid survey of the literature on introductions reveals certain generalities concerning the release or transplantation of exotic animals. A better understanding of the subject of exotic mammal introductions can be achieved within the context of this broader view.

1. There is a worldwide trend toward dissemination and establishment of exotic plant and animal species. This is progressing through both planned introductions and accidental escapes. Though it can be accelerated or retarded, the facts of the case and the forces at work indicate that the trend will continue indefinitely into the future.

2. There are still "wild" areas of the world where the endemic fauna and flora are relatively unmodified by recent introductions of exotics. For a variety of reasons it seems desirable to maintain such areas in their virgin condition.

3. The history of animal introductions reveals dismal failures and disastrous and disruptive consequences; as well as both successful introductions and those that quite definitely can be considered beneficial. A well defined but flexible policy appears to be needed.

4. Most introductions have not been made in the public interest. They have been haphazard affairs, not scientifically planned or executed. The history of exotic releases vividly points up the need for a systematic approach to the subject.

5. It is evident that we have not had in the past and still do not have sufficient information and knowledge to introduce exotic species with any assurance that they will be successes or failures, prove detrimental or beneficial. We cannot as yet predict consequences, especially long range side effects.

6. The principle dangers resulting from the introduction of an exotic species are the establishment and spread of diseases, the initiation of forces bringing about disruptive ecological changes, and hybridization resulting in inferior species or the elimination of species.

7. There is evidence that vacant ecological niches exist, some created through natural processes and others brought into existence by the activities of man. There is a growing demand to fill these with game species. Almost nothing is known about the existence, nature and extent of vacant ecological niches.

8. Most of the introduced species that are now abundant were not established as a result of the first introduction.

9. Participation in outdoor recreation activities, including big game hunting, will grow. Accompanying stepped up demand by sportsmen for increased game supplies is to be expected. The introduction of exotics is one approach toward satisfying the demand.

10. The main causes of failure of past introductions were failure to consider the characteristics of the species to be introduced, failure to determine in advance climatic and habitat requirements and failure to liberate a sufficient number of healthy individuals under conditions comparable to the original environment.

OPINIONS ON EXOTICS

Exotic ungulates in the Americas have a history dating back to the first explorations and settlements in the New World. Soon after the Americas were colonized, the horse and hog became established as feral animals and were to be followed in some areas by representatives of many other domestic groups. The introduction of wild game came later in time, but dates back at least to the 18th century. It is too late, therefore, to decide whether exotic ungulates should not be introduced. They are already here.

We can only decide the extent to which further introductions should be tolerated.

A dearth of fact provides a wide field for the expression of emotional opinion on the subject of exotics. There are excellent reasons why the introduction of exotics should be considered seriously for certain lands, and equally good reasons why such introductions should be opposed in other areas or under other circumstances.

Those who oppose the introductions of exotics often base their opposition on one or more of the following grounds: (a) Exotic species can create further land use conflicts in areas already fully stocked by domestic ungulates and native wild game. (b) Exotic big game may displace native species from habitats where these natives still exist. (c) Exotic species can disrupt the balance existing within natural communities, and thus destroy those areas that we hope to maintain in a primitive or representative natural state. (d) We should concentrate on preserving an American biota in America, an African biota in Africa, an Asian in Asia, and not accelerate an already world-wide trend toward biotic uniformity. (c) The money spent for exotic introductions would go much further if used in improving habitat conditions and preserving environment for native species. (f) Exotic ungulates can be difficult or impossible to control where circumstances favor their rapid spread and increase.

Those who favor the introduction of exotics base their arguments on the premise that North America has many vacant ecologic niches, not occupied or only partially filled by native species. Exotic animals could fill these niches and thus promote faunal diversity in this continent. This would be of value for: (a) Making available to the sportsmen a greater abundance and variety of shootable game. (b) Increasing yields of meat and other economically useful products from wild lands. (c) Proving an opportunity to preserve in America species that are in danger of extinction in their native lands.

Conflicting opinions on the desirability of exotic introductions have led the game departments of some states to come out in firm opposition to exotic ungulates, and have led other states to start a vigorous program aimed at widespread introductions of exotics. Those who strongly oppose exotic ungulates often offer enthusiastic approval of exotic game birds. Decisions should be based logically upon knowlege of the effects of earlier introductions on the land and its native biota, and on detailed studies of the ecology of the species proposed for introduction. But such knowledge and studies are limited and at present, there is inadquate information to support any firm conclusions. In the absence of such knowledge, and to protect the public interest on federal lands, it is important for the agencies concerned with the conservation of these lands to develop an interim policy governing the introduction of exotic ungulates. It is equally important that

they support the studies needed to acquire the necessary information.

REGULATION AND CONTROL OF EXOTIC BIG GAME

Federal regulations prevent the direct introduction and release in the United States of big game animals from foreign countries. Such animals can be imported by zoological gardens, or similar institutions, but may not be released from these places. The offspring of these zoo animals can be sold to private game farms or used to stock private or public land, subject to state regulation. State regulations governing the movement and release of exotics vary greatly. In Texas, private land owners can purchase, transport, and release exotic big game. In California, since 1963, the importation, transportation, or release of such animals by private individuals is prohibited. California, therefore, has tight control over exotic big game releases; Texas has virtually no control. Both states have well established populations of exotics over which no effective control has been exercised. New Mexico and Nevada propose releases of exotic big game, the latter on federal land. Arizona and California propose to restrict or prevent such releases.

States that favor the release of exotic big game believe that they can control the numbers and distribution of these animals through hunting. However, few states have actually demonstrated the ability to consistently control the numbers of any species of big game, native or exotic, that makes effective use of cover, is abundant, and widely distributed. Such species as the horse, zebra, or perhaps oryx, that occupy an open habitat, perhaps can be easily controlled. Species such as the kudu, various deer, and small antelope that prefer dense, brushy cover, can be difficult to control under most conditions. Departments of Game that are willing and able to attempt control over the numbers of exotics, can be readily prevented from doing so by the action of Fish and Game Commissions, just as some state departments have been prevented from efforts to control the numbers of native deer. The lack of uniformity of state regulations and the probability of exotic release and spread on federal lands creates a federal problem.

EVIDENCE FROM RECENT EXOTIC INTRODUCTIONS

The Texas Situation: Into the state of Texas more species of exotic ungulates have been introduced than into any other comparable area of North America with which these writers are familiar. Exotic big game animals are now established in 48 of the 254 counties in the state, from the arid west to the humid east. Jackson (1964) has listed the following species of exotics found in Texas with the approximate numbers of each:

Axis deer (Cervus axis)	2,196
Sika deer (Cervus nippon)	634
Fallow deer (Cervus dama)	220
Sambar deer (Cervus rusa)	38
Barasingha deer (C. duvauceli)	32
Red deer (Cervus elaphus)	21
Barbary sheep (Ammotragus lervia)	1,588
Mouflon sheep (Ovis musimon)	1,846
Blackbuck (Antilope cervic apra)	3,693
Nilgai (Boselaphus tragocamelus)	3,334
Eland (Taurotragus oryx)	5
Oryx (oryx gazella)	3
Wild boar (sus scrofa)	Over 575

Except for the smaller numbers, all of the above figures are estimates and probably conservative. The rate of introduction, spread and increase of exotics has been accelerating. Although most species are on private ranches under fence, some are now well established and increasing in the wild. The axis deer, fallow deer, red deer, Barbary sheep, mouflon, blackbuck, nilgai, and wild boar all have unfenced land. Species that have shown little increase or have remained static in numbers are the sambar, barasingha, red deer. The eland and oryx, recently introduced, have thus far failed to reproduce.

There is little information available on competition between native and exotic ungulates. A paper by Sanders (1963), based on a study near Laredo, reports that the blackbuck, sika deer, mouflon, axis deer and native white-tailed deer tend to seek out different, non-conflicting habitats. In this area, however, the exotics were barely maintaining their numbers and not increasing. White-tailed deer were abundant and thriving. "Deplorable range conditions due to chronic overgrazing by cattle" were said to exist on the ranch used as a study area.

An example of the rate of increase and spread of an exotic ungulate is provided by the nilgai. This species was introduced in 1930 to a ranch on the lower south Texas coast. The original brookstock was thought to be twelve. The species now occupies 1,425,000 acres on six adjoining ranches and numbers 3,334.

The California Situation. The vegetation of California has been drastically modified through overgrazing, mostly attributed to domestic livestock, but added to by feral ungulates. Most of the grasslands are now dominated by exotic annual grasses and forbs brought in, mostly, along with domestic animals. Soon after Spanish settlement, feral horses and cattle spread over the grasslands of Calfironia. Early explorers from the American states found herds of wild horses and cattle existing along

with abundant populations of native elk, deer, and antelope. Most of the damage to the rangelands must be blamed on the combination of severe drought and unchecked increase in domestic livestock.

Since its early history, many species of wild exotic big game have been introduced into California. A survey by the California Department of Fish and Game shows that twelve species of exotic wild ungulates have been established in the state. These include:

Fallow deer	500 plus
Spotted deer (Cervus alfredi?)	60
Black deer (?)	20
Sambar deer (Cervus unicolor)	10
Axis deer (Cervus axis)	?
Sika deer (Cervus nippon)	?
Barbary sheep (Ammontragus lervia)	300
Tahr (hemitragus jemlaicus)	60
Burchell Zebra (Equus burchellii)	15
Wildebeeste (Connochoetes taurinus)	?
Mouflon (Ovis musimon)	15
Wild boar (Sus scrofa)	3,000 plus

Of these species only the wild boar can be considered as widely and successfully established in the wild. It has maintained itself, increased and spread from the original introduction site since it was first brought into the state in the 1920's. It now ranges from the Carmel Valley south through the Santa Lucia Mountains as far as Nacimiento Lake, a distance of at least 70 miles from the original site. Throughout the area occupied by the wild boar, the native black-tailed deer remains abundant.

For nearly twenty years, white fallow deer have been present on the Ridgewood Ranch near Ukiah. Fifty animals were introduced, and an estimated 250 to 300 are now present. The species has not spread widely. The black-tailed deer remains very abundant in the same area.

Near Drake's Bay, the Ottinger Ranch supports three kinds of deer said to be fallow, spotted and black deer. There were introduced around 1940 and have increased from 65 to an estimated 220. They have not dispersed widely. The native black-tailed deer remains abundant in the same area.

The greatest variety of exotic big game exits on or has escaped from the Heart Ranch near San Simeon. Here the fallow deer, sambar, axis deer, Barbary sheep, tahr, zebra, wildebeest and perhaps other species are to be found. The Barbary sheep and tahr are said to have spread into the Santa Lucia Mountains. Both numbers and distribution are only a guess.

New Mexico. Much publicity has been given to proposals for the introduction of exotic big game into New Mexico. One species, the Barbary sheep, has been successfully introduced, and the introduction of others is planned. It has been pointed out that New Mexico could provide a haven for species threatened with extinction in Africa. Kudu, gemsbuck and ibex have been brought from Africa to the Albuquerque zoo. When sufficient offspring have been produced, it is planned to release these three species into wild areas.

The Barbary sheep was deliberately released in the Canadian River canyon of northeastern New Mexico in 1950. Since then, there have been two unplanned releases of Barbary sheep in western and southern New Mexico. The Canadian River introduction has been studied. Little is known of the status of sheep in the two other areas. In the Canadian River canyon, the Barbary sheep population increased from 52 to more than a thousand between 1950 and 1961. From the original release site, near Roy, they have spread northward as far as Colorado, a distance of 80 miles, and southward beyond the Conchas Reservoir, a distance of at least 50 miles. The spread has mostly been confined to the habitat provided by the brush-covered, rocky rims of the canyon. East and west of the canyon, rolling grassy plains occur and these have not been occupied by sheep. The habitat characteristic of the Canadian rims, however, continues on mesa slopes over a large area of New Mexico. There is no real barrier to the continued spread of the sheep.

In 1962 it was thought that the Barbary sheep had decreased since hunters failed to find sheep in places where they had been located in earlier years. In 1963 and 1964 hunting was discontinued. In the absence of hunting, it has been virtually impossible to keep up with the numbers or distribution of the sheep. Some believe that the sheep have not decreased, but have dispersed more widely. Only further study will reveal the truth. The kind of habitat occupied is rough and hard to traverse, making it difficult to control the Barbary sheep if they once become both widely dispersed and numerous. In the absence of hunting, the use of radio-tagged sheep might provide the needed information on dispersal and population ecology.

Nevada: Nevada has no reported populations of exotic big game, although feral horses and burros are widely distributed. The Fish and Game Commission, however, has proposed the introduction of the Barbary sheep into the state. Since it was planned to release these animals on federal land, it was thought advisable by the Bureau of Land Management, the agency concerned with this land, to have an impartial committee review the situation and the possible problems involved. The introduction of Barbary sheep has, therefore, been postponed until such time as a federal policy governing future introductions of exotic big game can be decided upon.

The proposed release site for Barbary sheep lies in the Seven Troughs Range Northwest of Lovelock. The area was chosen because it seemed to present a minimum chance for conflict between Barbary sheep and native big game. It is bounded by deserts, saltbush flats, alkali lakes and other habitat thought poorly suited to the sheep and likely to serve as a barrier to their spread. Big game are scarce in the area. A few mule deer occur in mountains near the western boundary; a small band of antelope has been reported near the eastern boundary; small bands of mustangs and wild burros range over the area. The State, itself, has scattered populations of the desert bighorn sheep (Ovis canadensis nelsoni) as well as the largest remaining concentrations of this animal.

The proposed release area is poor habitat for native big game since the mountains do not rise high enough to support the better browse-plant communities. The entire region is dry, overgrazed, and probably overstocked with domestic livestock. It forms a summer range for cattle and a winter range for sheep. Grass cover is dominated by exotic annuals, such as cheat grass and red brome. The exotic chukar partridge is well established and numerous.

There is no question, therefore, of interference with an undisturbed native biota. The nearest native bighorn sheep occur 125 air line miles away in the country west of Walker Lake. With the introduction of bighorn to the Sheldon Refuge, native sheep will be located within 100 miles of the release site.

If Barbary sheep are to be introduced into Nevada, the Seven Troughs Range provides a site least likely to provide conflict with other more important land uses. There is no way, however, for predicting whether the sheep will survive in, or remain in, the area in which they are to be released. If they should become established, their impact on the range is not likely to improve conditions.

The greatest danger from such an introduction lies in the possibility of spread to existing desert bighorn ranges. If this occured, it could be a very real threat to the survival of the native species.

NICHES AND COMPETITION

Some problems involved with exotic big game are best viewed in the light of happenings over the past 8,000 to 9,000 years. The ungulate populations of North America were vastly different 9,000 years ago from what they were when the Europeans first arrived in America. The variety and abundance of American ungulates at the end of the last glacial age equalled that to be found in the savannas of Africa today. For reasons not fully understood, most of these animals became extinct. Some

believe that primitive man was a factor in causing these extinctions. The botanical evidence suggests that the plant communities that supported the post-Pleistocene abundance and variety of big game were not different from those that exist today. From these and other data, it can be postulated that the extinctions of native ungulates left ecologic niches that have not yet been filled by those species that survived in America.

The introduction of exotic species to America differs only in degree from the normal changes that have taken place in modern man's absence. The moose, caribous, mountain sheep, elk and bison, for examples, are exotics in the sense that they are relatively recent immigrants from Eurasia. They have moved into a continent previously occuped by such long-established residents as the mule deer, pronghorn and white-tailed deer. Presumably, they have survived here only because they were more adaptable, better competitors or found vacant niches that could be occupied.

The success of various feral ungulates might be considered further evidence for vacant niches. The speed with which the mustang increased in numbers and spread over the Americas suggests that it found a niche not occupied by any competing species. There is no evidence that it has anywhere displaced native ungulates. Feral hogs and feral burros have also adapted to North America with apparent ease and have occupied extensive areas. The evidence for competition with or displacement of native ungulates is inconclusive. By contrast, except for islands, the feral goat and feral sheep have not done well in the Americas, although small populations hold out in some places.

In addition to feral ungulates, there have been many introductions of wild exotic ungulates into North America. These introductions have met with varying degrees of success. There is as yet little evidence of serious conflict between native big game and the exotic wild species. However, the situations involved have not yet been adequately studied.

In considering the arguments for the introduction of exotics, the basic premise, that vacant niches do exist, seems to be supported by the available evidence. The assumption, however, that suitable species can be found to fill these niches finds less support. Most exotic big game introductions have been only partial successes, and many have failed. Costs are relatively high. It is virtually impossible to predict whether a species will adapt to an American environment in advance of its actual introduction. Even when a species has been introduced, it may take many years, or decades, before we can know whether or not it will ultimately survive, increase and spread, or alternatively, fail.

MAINTAINING THE PRIMITIVE SCENCE AND NATIVE BIOTA

An opposition to the introduction of exotics based on a desire to maintain, or restore, the primitive scene in America, as it was before civilized man began to modify it, as certainly legitimate. It should be realized, however, that it is a desire to maintain the pre-Columbian, or pre-settlement scene, with the natural communities that existed at that time. Further back in time other natural communites did exist. There can be an equally legitimate desire to attempt to restore a much earlier American biota through introduction of the near relatives of new extinct American forms. The scientific value of such an attempt is as obvious as the value of preserving or restoring the Pre-Columbian biota.

DISRUPTIVE EFFECTS OF EXOTICS AND LAND-USE CONFLICTS

Thinking on the subject of exotic big game is colored by the unfortunate consequences of exotic introductions on islands. The examples of Hawaii and New Zealand, where severe disruption of the native biota took place when exotic ungulates were introducted, are well known. Australia, island-like in its isolation from other continents, provides similar illustrations. In Europe, hybridization has caused the extermination of near loss of native ungulate races and species. However, evidence of disruptive effects from the large continents similar to that from islands is not available. Nevertheless, since this threat is always present, the burden of proof must rest on those who would introduce new species. Before an exotic should be turned loose, it should be demonstrated that it will not cause disruption or displacement in the native biota or serious conflict with other, more valuable forms of land use. This does not rule out the introductions of exotics in areas that do not have primary value for preservation of native biota, or high economic value for other conflicting land uses. Introductions into such areas should be preceded by evidence that the new species can be confined to these areas.

GUIDELINES FOR THE INTRODUCTION OF EXOTIC BIG GAME ANIMALS

When an animal species is introduced into any environment, it has both the potential to produce disruptive, often uncontrollable forces as well as to fill a vacan niche and fit into an existing ecological pattern with beneficial rather than deleterious effects. Big game releases, therefore, should be preceded by scientific study with the findings carefully evaluated and the release systematically plannted. It should be determined that the introduction will fulfill a desirable objective, and that maximum safeguards have been taken to protect native biota. Provisions should be made for follow-up in the form of scientific investigations on the status of the released animal.

Some factors and conditions that should be considered as a guide to introductions are:

1. It should be objectively determined that there is a real need for for a proposed introduction, and it should appear likely that the introduction will have desirable ecological, recreational and economic impacts.

2. The introduction should fill a definite vacant ecologic niche, one not filled or suitable for a native species. The probable existence of such a niche should be reasonably well documented.

3. An introduction should not be considered if there is any danger even apprehension, over the action leading to drastic reduction or regional displacement of indigenous populations. Pending future study, the introduction of exotic big game species on federal lands should be governed by the necessity for protecting the native biota and for preventing conflict with other existing or porposed land uses.

4. Studies of the ecology of the animal considered for release should precede and guide introductions. Studies, should, likewise, be made to determine the suitability of the proposed release area.

5. Every effort should be made to study disease inter-relationships and to take steps for assuring effective guarantine resulting in disease-free game.

6. Precautions against hybridization should be taken by selecting animals that do not have close relatives in the country and rejecting those that do.

7. Small trial introductions in suitable areas using adequate numbers of stock should first be conduced on an experimental basis. The results should be carefully studied using the latest and best research methods. An evaluation of this introduction should serve as a basis for further action.

8. Before an exotic is introduced, assurance should be obtained that adequate control methods can be instigated to prevent overpopulation or spreading.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In view of the foregoing discussion and considerations, the following recommendations are made:

1. The introduction of an exotic species should be considered as a crucial decision taken only after thorough research and competent and unbiased evaluations. To insure this, the federal government should institute and encourage studies as soon as feasible, to gather data on the ecology of big game animals proposed for, or potentially suitable for, introduction into the United States. Studies should be instituted as soon as possible in areas where exotic big game are already established in the United States with a view toward determining their impact on the native biota and the characteristics of their population ecology, including rates of increase and distances of movement and dispersal, predation effect, disease status, degree of control and change in habits.

2. No exotic big game animals should be permitted in national parks, wilderness or primitive areas, wildlife refuges, native game ranges or other areas designated for the preservation of native flora and fauna in an undisturbed, or relatively undisturbed condition. To protect the above areas, exotic big game animals should be excluded from a buffer area surrounding each of these areas. The width of the buffer strip should be determined by the mobility of the exotic big game animals concerned, and the ease with which it can be controlled.

3. Exotic big game animals should be excluded from the vicinity of any area in which rare or uncommon native big game species occur until such time as it can be conclusively demonstrated that no conflict will occur between the native and the exotic species.

4. Exotic big game animals should be excluded from any area of federal land that is of primary value as livestock range and is already fully stocked with domestic livestock. Exceptions to this should be made only when it has been shown conclusively that the exotic animal will not compete with the domestic species.

5. To prevent conflict with other uses of the land such as timber production, farming, urban development, or intensively used recreation sites, exotic big game animals should be excluded from the vicinity of areas of primary value for these other purposes, except where it can be demonstrated that no conflict will occur.

6. On other lands, exotic big game may be introduced under permit from the federal government. The terms of such a permit must include a commitment by the state agency concerned to maintain numbers of exotics at levels determined by the federal agency to be within the safe carrying capacity of the habitat, and to any of the areas from which they are excluded for the reasons listed above.

7. Exotic big game animals that spread from state, other public, or private lands into federal lands, without permit, should be treated as trespassing livestock. The public agency or private individual responsible should be held liable for any damages that result from the spread of these exotics, and responsible for any expenses incurred in their control.

8. Policy in regard to the introduction of exotic mammals on public lands should be flexible, that is, periodically reviewed and if necessary, revised in light of new knowledge, new technology and the numerous and tremendous changes that are rapidly, and in some cases, permanently altering our environment. It should also reflect that the introduction of exotics is itself a force capable of drastic changes in environment; that considered in its totality, we are a part of this environment as well as being dependent upon its proper functioning for our existence.

RANGE MANAGEMENT AND MULTIPLE USE

Summary of Comments
by Glen D. Fulcher
Chief, Range Management Staff
Before the National Advisory Board Council
Washington, D. C., March 23, 1965

It is a pleasure to meet with you for the first time and make a few comments before introducing Mr. Gus Hormay of the Forest Service for his presentation on rest-rotation grazing.

Some of you must wonder, after hearing so much about multiple use, where range management fits into the Bureau's program. I am sure some of you must feel that domestic livestock grazing may be taking a backseat to the multiple use programs. This is certainly not true. The amount of land that might be taken by various other uses, and specifically out of range use, will be very insignificant. There will be some recreation sites and natural areas but the amount of land that will be taken from range use will be very small. Fortunately livestock grazing through good range management and proper use does not seriously compete with either recreation, wildlife, or watershed protection. It's when we get into abusive over-grazing that we run into conflict. Our objective then is good range management that assures proper range use. The Bureau's responsibility under its range program is to increase to and/or maintain a desired level of forage production, per unit area, consistent with watershed protection and other resource uses. Also, we have the responsibility to develop a program that will help to stabilize the local livestock industry dependent upon these public lands.

The Director has already told you that we are nearing the completion of our range adjudication program. By the target date of July 1, 1967, 97 percent of adjudication will be completed. With the completion of adjudication we are moving toward a new era of range management. We are developing guidelines for our management program that are broad and flexible and will allow specific objectives to be determined and carried out by the District Manager, his unit managers, and the local advisory board.

Specific actions that we hope to take:

1. Less attention to private base lands.

2. Greater attention to on-the-ground range management of the public lands.

3. With completion of the adjudication program, the discontinuation of range surveys as such.

4. Development of more intensive range management plans for both group and individual allotments.

5. Evaluation of effectiveness of our range management plans through allotment analysis (to most of you this means intensive range inspection). This will include:

    a. Determination of stocking rate by existing range surveys.

    b. Evaluation of the stocking rate determined by:

        (1) Actual use records

        (2) Utilization checks

        (3) Range trend

These last three items will be key factors in the determination of the effectiveness of the range program.

Other programs of interest:

1. Increased use of flexible range management programs in which the individual operator will have greater flexibility in the use of the range.

2. Increased emphasis on range rehabilitation to restore watershed protection, increase carrying capacity, and restore reductions in use.

3. Continued close cooperation in wildlife management with both State Fish and Game Departments and our own wildlife people to determine the best systems of management for critical wildlife ranges.

We are also initiating on a trial basis some rest-rotation systems. Therefore, at this time, I would like to turn the meeting over to Mr. Hormay who initiated this system. Since you will be hearing about the rest-rotation system from our State and district people, we thought it would be beneficial for Mr. Hormay to present a discussion of how and why he believes his system will work.

I appreciate this opportunity to briefly discuss our range management program with you, and I hope to become personally acquainted with each of you in the near future.

STATEMENT OF JOHN A. CARVER, JR.
UNDER SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR
To The National Advisory Board Council
March 23, 1965
And Transcript of Subsequent Discussion

First, let me apologize for being late.

I am an apologist for being late to this meeting, and let me apologize for not being at your first session, as I had intended to be. I felt that we might do as well with a work session as we could have done at the formal speech-making session and besides that I am in kind of a different position than I have been in past years.

I read with some interest the other day that the Vice President of the United States said he didn't have any power at all except the power of persuasion, and I don't even know if I got that much power. So I don't know if I like this new business very much, but it has changed to some extent. A burden has been called upon my time, so I am spending time now on a lot of things that I have been unfamiliar with in the past, trying to learn more about things that are going on in the Department and the other areas of activity and being called upon more and more to show up at ceremonials. The trouble is, word hasn't been passed along to the old committees which I have been accustomed to appearing before. They have told me that as the Under Secretary, you are supposed to go up, and they let you read a formal statement and they thank you, and you leave the sports behind to answer the questions.

Well, for four years I have been going before the committees and answering questions, and they can't get out of the habit. They can't remember that there are some things now that I don't know much about.

I spent two miserable hours today before the committee and yesterday, when I hoped to be here -- I was answering questions on something that I wasn't as well-prepared on as I might have been.

In this new position, as I have said, I have a different and wider scope and a different relationship with this and other advisory councils of the Department. However, we don't yet have a replacement

for me as an Assistant Secretary, so with your indulgence we will just forget there has been any change, and I will go ahead with this as a give and take session which we have been accustomed to having in the past and if, as I proceed, you find some point which you want to look into further, please feel free to do so.

Those of you who are on the grazing side and some of you on the wildlife side remember when the Board was considerably smaller. My first official appearance before the Council was in Salt Lake City in 1961, early in the new Administration.

The attention of that particular session was concentrated on procedural matters, the relationship of the Council to the Department, a proposal to broaden the membership of the State and National Boards, and some of you at least will remember that I emphasized that the basic keystone structure in the advisory organization is the district board and that it was and is a creature of the Congress and that the State and National boards have gained regulatory status only as representative extensions of the statutory district boards.

I touched on the concept of "multiple use" and summed it up by saying that it is really "prudent management." There is good precedent for this, by the way, going all the way back to Theodore Roosevelt, when he said:

> "All these various uses of our natural resources are so closely connected that they should be coordinated, and should be treated as part of one coherent plan and not in haphazard and piecemeal fashion."

The Council, following its reorganization, is a body capable of treating the problems of the uses of the land in a coordinated way and capable of presenting coherent recommendations.

In 1962 -- again, reviewing history -- at the Albuquerque meeting, we jointly tackled the problem of the conomics of operation of the public lands and particularly the relationship that the grazing fees bore to the total problem of economics. I had undertaken prior to that time, as some of you know, to point out the difficulties which were presented by an oversimplified view of the question of grazing fees, particularly by people who didn't understand forage management and the history of the Taylor Grazing Act in the West.

And you know that during that year of 1962 and early into 1963, we worked together on this matter in a most constructive fashion. In 1963, back here in Washington, I expressed a view, as I had in Albuquerque, at another meeting, that there wasn't any reason why the Department and the district boards, and State boards, and National Board could not come a great deal closer to common understanding of how to estimate grazing capacity; how to schedule increases or decreases in permitting grazing uses; how to provide for administrative review of actions and how to preserve the exercise of sound, common sense at the grass roots level.

I said then and I say again now, that a decent conservation job on the public's land is possible only with the cooperation of those who share in its use and that this cooperative task demands the best efforts of all of us -- each and everyone concerned with it.

Now, that is becoming, if anything, more true each year. A great overriding factor in our land management problems, indeed, in all of our governmental problems is the growing pressure of people upon lands and the growing pressures incident to just how many people there are. No commodity has increased in price or value as rapidly as land has increased in the last two or three decades.

Because of these presssures, because people recognize what are the peculiar and particular vulnerability of public lands to these pressures, we undertook in 1964 to face squarely the issue of land tenure -- one of the toughest kinds of questions which could be presented to any group and one to challenge this particular Council.

At last year's annual meeting -- again, to recall the Tenure Committee came up with a divided report. But it came up with it at a time when the Congress had just passed the Public Land Law Review Commission Bill. After our discussion, there was general agreement that this was an appropriate subject, an appropriate area, for intensive consideration by the Commission and that your recommendations before the Commission would carry weight in proportion to the extent that they were based on hard facts, sound logic and widely supported within all the elements of the Council and its constituencies, a situation not possible with a divided report.

Now, the Public Land Law Review Commission, for reasons which are not really appropriate for us to discuss here in any great depth, has not yet started its activities. But it will begin to work, and the fact that it is delayed has in no measure reduced the importance of that Commission, of that Commission approach.

If this Council devotes its efforts to bringing such kinds of materials and recommendations as it is capable of doing, then a standard may be set for other kinds of groups who will be presenting views before the Commission.

I will concede that that is becoming more and more difficult for the very reason of this indecision, if you will, about its beginning, its activities, and some grumbling and complaints about the appointment of the public members and failure of the two Houses of Congress to agree upon a procedure to start the work of the Commission.

Few people, I think, are any more aware than I am of the reason, nationally and in the Western States, to what is a genuine phenomenon in the political life of today, and that is the reaction of the American people to the concepts expressed by the President under the term of the New Conservation. The reaction followed the President's announcement, both in the State of the Union Message and in the so-called Message of February 8 and in some prior messages; the reaction on that has been convincing proof that there has been a general feeling throughout the body politic, if you will -- throughout the general public, that there ought to be more attention -- more conscientiousness of the conservation needs of the country.

I expressed it the other day after I came back from our meeting on the West Coast. I cam back and told the Secretary that I didn't think I had gotten through to this particular group, but only to their wives... Now, this was an interested group which had some concern -- it was a public power group, which had some concern about wild rivers and other proposals which were outlined in the President's Message, and these people had a stake in the further development of the rivers, and you could see why they would not react necessarily affirmatively to a discussion of this matter and yet it was pretty clear to me that their wives felt the message, husbands aside. And I found this a very interesting phenomenon because I had found this to be true campaigning last fall. I stumped around the country, about 20 States, in the

interest of re-election of the President that perhaps some of you didn't vote for -- but I found that it didn't make any difference what kind of audience I had -- that there was an affirmative response to the concept of the consciousness of this Administration and Secretary Udall to conservation needs of our country. This is a factor to be reckoned with. But as with the case of those people in the public power group to whom I had been speaking, at least those who are on the commercial side -- whether in oil, or in the forage end, or timber -- as well as those of you who are concerned with wildlife habitat and so on -- all of you are entitled to say what does the New Conservation mean to those of us who are accustomed to equating conservation with sustained yields of material things -- range management, forest management, hydro-electric power, mineral development, and the like?

And perhaps you are entitled to ask whether aesthetic considerations have preempted the field -- whether there is no longer any room for practical consideration for the wise husbandry of material resources? Well, I think a moment's thought will demonstrate that that is clearly not the situation. The President's emphasis on natural beauty merely refocuses the spotlight of conservation emphasis on the urban areas of the country, but it doesn't mean any less emphasis on the very grave problem of the proper management of our public lands. The old work must go on, even though there is an attempt -- perhaps an overdue attempt -- to apply the same concepts to the question of what kind of cities we are going to have to live in and the purification of streams in dealing with problems of exploding suburbs, multiplying super highways, an alarming crime rate and so on.

Because there is an unfinished agenda of conservation in the conventional theme. That's what I said in Portland. Our efforts in this direction have not diminished, and they must not diminish. This is not one bit less important than it ever was, that there be a general agreement in our consensus on the land management, on these decisions which face our country.

We have already heard -- we have all heard, indeed, we spent a lot of time in these meetings talking about the relationship of our land administration problems on the commercial side to recreation. This really oversimplifies it. It is not the immediate pressure upon the land for recreation use as opposed to some commercial use. Because

as the pressures grow, there will be tougher and tougher refinements of the necessity for making decisions on the use of land and it is important that we don't stand firm on one phase of the controversy to have the march of time take the decision away from us.

The elements which we consider for an overall program include the development and rehabilitation of the wealth-producing natural resources. I think the Department, and the Administration have much to boast about in the this aspect of our work. Certainly, the favorable reaction which has come to some of our reseeding projects and other projects from segments of the community other than those who are the immediate users have shown that money invested in improving the range has a multiplied effect that comes back into the economy.

I have been interested in reading some of the clippings from the Statesman and some of the other papers which serve the area of the Vale Project in Oregon to find that this expenditure there is being widely hailed, not just from the users who theoretically are the principal beneficiaries, but from the whole general economy of the region.

There is much more land in the West which can be economically reseeded. The selection of the places and the sites for this represent management decisions which can only be undertaken as we have stability in the question of management of our lands. By "stability," I am talking about stability of land use, some resolution of the tenure question. But I am also talking about good relationships between the users and their communities and between the users and the land managers, particularly on the Federal side.

The Vale Project and other activities like it, by carrying the Department's support and the support of the Administration and the appropriation committees, demonstrates the faith of the Administration in the future of domestic livestock raising on public lands, to demonstrate an intention to stabilize this grazing use and at the same time see that other uses are protected to stabilize the general public interest.

It is probable that in the future we will have an even wider choice of alternative decisions than ever before. The available alternatives for action must be carefully weighed and considered, and it is an article, at least of my faith of public administration, that the public -- as representatives of the public and the public generally,

must be brought into the decision-making process. That you must have the opportunity at every level which is represented here, of commenting on alternatives which affect you, either immediately or prospectively in terms of land use. Thus, if there is a movement afoot to shift away from allotments to a common use or the other way about, this is a matter which has got to be discussed and brought into focus by those people who are affected by it. If there is going to be a change in district organization, or a change in the organization of any other part of the outfit which you are dealing with, then it seems to me that you got to be included - you can't be left out on the outside to be informed after the deed is done. That doesn't mean that your recommendations necessarily are going to be followed, but we do carry on our business in a goldfish bowl, and I think that is very important.

Secretary Udall said a couple of months ago that there is heartening evidence that the lines traditionally separating the "users" on the one hand and the "protectionists" on the other are being softened by reason and understanding. I think that is basically true in the areas with which we are, at this meeting, concerned. I think it is true in the land areas. I would disagree with the Secretary when it comes to the question of the development of the water resources of the country. I think the lines are getting hardened between the users and the protectionists, if you will, and I think there is trouble yet to come, and Bruce Bowler will be able to testify as to how that is shaping up in some of the areas in Idaho.

We must continue our efforts to get into all of the resources areas the kinds of communication which we have prided ourselves on as represented by this Council and others, in the dry land areas, and it is a source of a good deal of satisfaction that the Council will continue to cooperate.

You certainly know that I will continue to cooperate as long as it is a mutual, fair kind of cooperation. If, at any time you think that it is a superficial or shallow thing, then you will be quite correct in being resentful.

Now, there are some hard questions which should be kicked around which have reached your ears, some by rumors and some by direct communication from State Directors, or others, and I know that in this meeting so far the Director and the Associate Director have talked to you about district consolidation and reorganization.

The drive for Government economy is one to which we are all philosophically wedded. I don't know of any public man or private individual who would say that the Government ought to not operate as economically as it can. But, I, for one, do not believe in having an economy which is one-sided. I don't believe that the Government should save money at the expense of the private sector without at least a recognition that that is what is happening. That is why, when I was out in Idaho three or four weeks ago, I met with a group of grazing users from northwestern Utah and listened with a good deal of interest to their story that some of our activities were having, I think, the unintended result of costing them more in the interest of our saving. That may be appropriate at times, and as I told the Director and State Director, it seemed to me that this is the kind of thing to which, if there is an answer, the people can be brought in and the matter can be discussed with them and they can see the motivation and if it is a good idea, I think we can count on the users to agree to any reorganization or shifts which have the genuine effect of really being a more economic and efficient way of doing business.

The economy, however, to the user, is just as important as the economy to the Government. So the Director said to me, as I am sure he said to you, that each proposed change will be brought formally before the appropriate district board if it has not been already presented and the advice of the board will be carefully considered. This is a good thing for the Director to say, because this is what the laws say as far as any changes of the boundaries are concerned, and I am sure I had never had any intention of doing it any other way. But the fact is, when you get into this kind of reorganization, sometimes you tend to not go back and check your charter.

It has been reported to me that Judge Hughes this morning distinguished between the organization and location of BLM offices and the employees serving -- servicing -- districts and the organization and location of the district advisory boards. I think that's a very useful distinction. I am sure it is something which you and the Director will be working about for the balance of this meeting, and I have no desire or intention to get in the middle of it, other than to give to you, as I have given to the Director, the general concept that all factors must be honestly taken into account -- that in addition to considering the savings which we may have, we should also consider, if there are things, major costs which are accruing to the users.

Returning a moment to the work of the Public Land Law Review Commission, it has not yet organized. We do have a good many public land matters on the agenda. So we will continue to be working with you on legislative and other kinds of proposals which will be made to the Congress.

That about concludes what I had sort of formally set up to say today. But I have in my own mind felt that the most useful thing that I could do would be to do what I have done in the past, and that is to get some sense of your feelings about these matters by exposing myself to questions from the floor, and because I was so ungracious as not to come to your first meeting, I assure you now that absent some summons from the President or the Secretary, I will be here as long as you want to hold me on the griddle.

Mr. Chairman, I will turn the meeting back to you with the statement that I will be glad to answer your questions.

JUDGE HUGHES: We are glad to have you here. We haven't been thinking of methods of putting you on the griddle.

One thing -- give us a little bit more of your thinking in connection with the Public Lands Review Commission. How will it be set up as far as you are advised?

MR. CARVER: Well, I certainly would be glad to do that, Judge, insofar as I am advised, which is not much.

I have been maintaining quite close contact with the Chairman Aspinall, whose great leadership resulted in the enactment of the bill. I suppose that I am not saying anything that hasn't been somewhat publicly stated by the principals involved, if I say that there was sort of a general congressional dissatisfaction with the methods of the selection and appointment of the public members, and a generally expressed view that some of them, at least, didn't have the kind of knowledge or basic understanding of public land administration which the framers of the bill had felt the public members should have.

There are, of course, two sides to that story. Since the other side, the President's side -- since I as a member of the Administration have not the authority or power to justify or explain the President's appointment, certainly not to criticize them, I will only say that the congressional people who have discussed it with me have fully

recognized that whatever they thought was going to happen under the bill, the President had the power to make the public appointments anyway he chose. Because that is the prerogative given to the President under the bill.

This particular Commission, however, has 12 of the 19 members from the legislative side, so that any feeling that the President has over-reached, or stacked, or anything like that -- the control of the voting is on the legislative side of the Commission. This is exactly as it should be. I never criticized -- there is a direct connection between the recommendation and the enactment of the laws. We have had a lot of these commissions in the past and too often there hasn't been a connection between the recommendations and the enactment.

Now, as to the timing, there is one other factor, and that is some question about who the chairman should be. The law provides that the 18 members -- six public members appointed by the President and the 12 congressional members -- should select a 19th member who would serve as their chairman.

It would be fair to say that there have been two or three candidates, and there has been a disagreement between the House and the Senate as to (1) what type of person should be chairman, and (2) what person should be chairman. Neither of those questions has as yet been resolved, although there is some evidence now that it is coming nearer resolution.

The law also provides there should be a staff director, and this, of course, would be a very key appointment. Yet you can't talk about the staff director until you are organized, because it is the Commission itself which has to make the appointment.

There is also the Advisory Council which the law creates, and this the Commission will have to wrestle with, too. Then, of course, on the more beaurocractic level, it was felt when the law was enacted, that it would be organized soon enough to undertake to go to Congress for its own appropriation since it is a special commission, not the creature of any department. Since it has not been organized, the budget for 1966 has been closed without an item in it. There is an item in the '65 budget which hasn't been tapped yet so we are going to have to have some special budget problems once it gets started. These are all sorts of negative considerations.

Chairman Aspinall in February said he thought no action would take place within the next 30 days. Well, that 30 days has gone by. The Chairman does not choose his words lightly. I think by that it could be reasonably inferred that thereafter there would be some action, and I think there will be. But the personality, the corporate personality of the Commission is by no means yet assured. I wouldn't be able to say, Judge, how it is going to go.

JUDGE HUGHES: Any other questions or issues that members of the Council would like to hear the Secretary discuss?

QUESTION:[1/] Are they working on a permanent basis at all? Talking about elections in the districts, all this change that has come about or has come up.

MR. CARVER: Are you relating this work to the Public Land Law Review Commission or the Department?

QUESTION: Do they take into consideration what we are doing here and the record we have made through the years by this Council?

MR. CARVER: You mean the Commission?

QUESTION: Yes. I would imagine they would take some of our thoughts in the matter. Is that wishful thinking?

MR. CARVER: I am sure that they will, but I am equally sure that they won't automatically. Somebody is going to have to bring them to the Commission's attention and there is going to have to be some rather careful work done to get the consensus, unified recommendations of this Council. I recognize what your problems are. Your problems are very simple -- that you don't know what kind of commission you are aiming this at, yet, and furthermore, you got a lot of immediate problems that are causing you a lot of travail and a lot of worry here, and absent some resolution of these problems, it is unlikely that the Council itself is going to settle down to the kind of a unified attack on, let's say, the tenure problem, which is necessary.

1/ With the exception of Under Secretary Carver, Associate Director Hochmuth, and Chairman Hughes, the official transcript does not identify by name the participants in this discussion.

It is a tough kind of assignment to come up with a consensus as to what kind of security there should be in the use of grazing lands, taking into account all of the interests which are represented here. I am convinced that we can get there. I am personally willing to spend some time on it. But I don't think it is going to come automatically.

QUESTION: In connection with this question, in view of the fact that the Commission is about to meet in July, perhaps in legislation and changes, perhaps there should be a moratorium of this board or in new laws and legislation -- how do you react to that?

MR. CARVER: I personally would think that this would be a great mistake. Because the world goes on. Decisions can be made in two or three ways, and one of the most effective and most frustrating ways of making decisions is to do nothing. I don't think the Council ought to get itself in the position of agreeing to inaction for any purpose or for any period of time simply because I think that inaction is every bit as much a decision as action.

If we are doing something wrong which this Council disagrees with, we shouldn't be relieved from your pressure to make us straighten up and fly right simply because there is a commission functioning. That is -- this is a long lapse of time. After the Commission files its report, it could be ten or fifteen years before major action would be completed on all of the recommendations.

Congress gave us its intention that we should go on with our regular business by the passage of the Classification and Multiple Use Act, and the Public Sale Act. In a rather meticulous way they showed how they felt on how we should carry on our business through these temporary laws in the interim. My strong feeling would be that pendency of Commission action should be an objective of your work, but not a substitute of the recommended action of which you are capable of providing us.

QUESTION: Mr. Secretary, those laws, the Public Sale Law and the Multiple Use, were they permanent laws or were they made to expire at the end of the time that this report was filed?

MR. CARVER: Those two laws were made to expire coincident with the action -- with the filing -- I think the same date -- same date as the Commission's report. They are, in terms, temporary laws.

QUESTION: What would happen -- it would be five years from the time they filed the report and by the time Congress accepted their report and maybe came up with a permanent law -- will we be without a multiple use law if the Congress fails to take action after '68?

MR. CARVER: I think that you would, in terms, be without one, but I have strong feeling that Congress would look with great favor upon filling up the gap which might exist between one and the other. Certainly, if we do our job right under the Multiple Use Act -- and that's a very big problem for us -- if we do our job right under it, it ought to furnish the laboratory for the kind of laws which are necessary for the long haul, for the long haul in this area. Clearly, that's what the Congress intended, because if you look at the Classification and Multiple Use Act, there is a considerable amount of attention shown in there to the form and method by which this should be implemented. Various things that have to happen -- in what order -- and the clear evidence in that bill is that Congress is trying its best -- trying the best it can -- to fix standards for the management and use of the lands in a fair way, while the Commission is considering what should be done as a permanent policy of the United States.

COMMENT: It seems to me along that line, things that have been transpiring in the last several years, we have met here regularly and certain resolutions have been made and certain laws have been made. Now, in connection with the thing that we are discussing on this multiple use, it occurs to me that in the event that after the Land Law Review Commission has completed its study and has made its report, that all of these things must go on. There isn't a stopping there. I see no reason why there should be a difference between this particular item and all of the other things we have been doing over the years.

MR. CARVER: I think that's a pretty fair statement, certainly, if I understand it correctly, my philosophy is that -- and I have said it before -- my own concept of multiple use is using your head, and if we have been using our heads in the past, we ought to continue to use our heads in the future.

In other words, what we ought to be doing is to meet the test of common sense. If it meets the test of common sense, it is likely to be widely accepted.

I might, in this connection, say something which I had intended to, but overlooked in my presentation here.

Some of you will remember when I was confirmed as Assistant Secretary four years ago, I was asked what I could do about pending legislation which would allow the United States district courts in the districts where the land is located to hear these land controversies. I promised to do everything I could to get a favorable Department report on that, and we eventually did, and it became the law.

Now, the wheel of time has turned, and we are beginning to get the results of judicial scrutiny of our actions at the field level. I don't know whether I will always have this opinion, but at the present time I am vastly satisfied with the wisdom of that action, because, at least from what I have seen so far, there has been a disposition which I predicted at the time; that is, those judges out there where the land is, knowing all of the facts and all of the circumstances, are going to hold us to a standard of administration which meets the test of common sense, and a test which sometimes we are not as able to do looking at a cold record in this direction.

I don't mean that in criticism of anybody who goes over these records. Now, this will have a tendency, at least if my own prediction is correct, of improving the quality of consideration of these land matters at the field level. I called one of the State Directors -- one of the BLM State Directors -- the other day whose name had been spelled wrong, in a case which has finally come to decision, and asked if he is the same man, and he said he was. I said, what is that going to do to us now? He said that is going to straighten us up. He also thought it was going to do some damage, but at least, what I am trying to get out is, I like to report sometimes we get through with things, and here was a reform which we sought to make which is now paying its dividends. I think the dividends are good. I think the dividends will continue to be good if we do a good job. But that's a parenthetical assertion.

QUESTION: I was interested in what you said about the problems facing this group at the present time, and I think we have a good many housekeeping problems that we will probably get over, but the thing that seems to be before us that we are treading water on at the present time, and have not been able to complete our discussions on, or make a decision on -- these are the problems -- they are on the classification criteria for classification of the lands and as we understand, there will be a hearing Thursday on this. This encompasses a new

philosophy of land management in the retention from multiple use management. What is the schedule of accepting these criteria and putting them in effect as far as you are concerned?

MR. CARVER: Well, as far as I am concerned, and some of the Director's staff may recognize again some language as to which we disagree, as far as I am concerned, the Congress, when it directed us to go through this hearing procedure, directed us to consider fairly and squarely the recommendations and information we get, and until we find out what kind of reaction we are getting to, it would not be fair to say we have made up our minds as to exactly what is going to be in the criteria.

The second thing that I would like to say is that when the Congress used the language it did, by disposition and retention and management, the Congress was not, in my opinion, undertaking to shortcircuit the process of policy-making which in the concurrent legislation, that is, in the Public Land Law Review Commission, it was committing to the Commission. To me the concept is quite simple. What the Congress told us to do was, to tell the public what standards we apply when we make decisions concerning the use of lands -- to lay out, so to speak, the framework against which the decision-making process goes on.

I don't think the Congress was telling us to retain lands, and I don't think the Congress was telling us to dispose of lands. The Congress said, if you retain or if you dispose, and if you apply a value judgement or any other kind of judgement as to whether you retain or dispose, you are supposed to be able to explain to the public in advance so that they can comment -- so they can comment on the rulings and decision against which those decisions are made.

In that context, that is no more than simple justice. We had not ought to make dispositions of public lands save under a regulatory structure which the public is aware of. If we have to make a decision or judgement between whether the land should be homesteaded or patented for homesteading or left in grazing use, and if, and I say "if," because this isn't in our regulations -- maybe it is -- if one of the factors on that is a consideration of what kind of crop is to be grown there -- I don't think that is in our regulations, so I can use that -- if that is one of our considerations, then that consideration ought to be spelled out so people can say (1) whether they think that is a fair way to do it and can test the regulation itself, and (2) if it is a fair way, then people are going to know about it.

Taking this hypothetical case one step further, if we say we are going to let the agricultural entry for such and such a crop, and it isn't suitable for that kind of crop, the grazing operator knows where he fits. If, on the other hand, we intend, and I don't say we do, but if we should intend to make an allotment of a certain amount of the grazing capacity to wildlife, then our regulations ought to say so. Not that we shouldn't do it one way or the other, I am not making any statement as to which way it ought to be, but merely the procedure to be followed on it. This is quite separate and apart from the effort which the Director -- any Director -- would make to see that he got some kind of administrative integrity in his organization -- that he has some unity of management objectives and so on. I don't think that is necessarily related to the purposes of the Classification and Multiple Use Act. But, in the rule-making process, we are going to hear comments from people like you -- all of you -- as to this thing, and when we get all through with it, at that point the Congress is going to take a look at it, too, because that is also provided. We can't get too far from home base on this thing.

I understand that there is some short-circuting of this -- in other words, people are expressing the view that we are using this as an excuse to either (1) retain, or (2) dispose of. I don't see that as the purpose at all. There isn't any excuse to do anything except to do whatever we do in accordance with an orderly process which can be measured and checked.

Just an ordinary principle of administrative law, as far as I am concerned.

COMMENT: There is a recent Federal Court decision that granted rights. The Bureau and Board upheld it as not being satisfactory proof. Yet, the Court in its decision gave him an absolute deed to the property.

MR. CARVER: You are talking about that Stewart case. That's the one that I am talking about, too. I don't think -- I don't know anything about the merits of that case. I know something about the facts of it. I don't know anything about the merits of it.

What I was trying to say is, that the healthy aspects of that decision was that a good deal of backing and filling and jimmying

around on the part of the Government as to what the rules were which finally caused a Court to get out of patience and to say, the hell with that. So the lesson we ought to learn from it is not that the Court is trying to give away the public lands, but rather, we ought to carry on our business so the Courts don't get out of patience with us.

COMMENT: A new set of rules would set that up.

MR. CARVER: That's what the Court said in the first paragraph. It may have been a bad land decision, but in terms of pulling the Government up by the scruff of the neck and saying, you can't jimmy around like this forever -- that's a pretty healthy judgement.

I disagree with that decision.

COMMENT: I agree with the decision. We disapproved it there.

MR. CARVER: You mean the district board disapproved it for homestead entry. You have a lot of homework to do with your Judge out there, then.

JUDGE HUGHES: Judges are right.

MR. CARVER: Judges are right -- that's right.

QUESTION: Mr. Secretary, do you anticipate the Secretary can move fast enough to make determinations as to classify all these lands by the time the Commission makes its report?

MR. CARVER: No, sir. As far as I am concerned, and here again, I am strictly in a personal capacity right now, but we have a hell of a time keeping up with the classification burden upon us in those cases where people are yelling for us to do something about such and such a tract of land. Now, a general classification, on a big, broad basis, could be made tentative in vast areas, maybe. But in terms of the kind of classification decision for either retention or disposition on the basis of a specific tract of land, somebody's got to have an action before somebody. Otherwise you don't know whether you are working on the area which needs the best attention.

For example, suppose we go out and say, here is a piece of land which seems to us to be ideally suited for municipal expansion, and suppose that particular city got a bad board of alderman, or suppose they don't care, or suppose they think they want to expand in the other direction and they say, so what, it is nothing to us? In the meantime, some other city may be screaming bloody murder to get some public lands on its outskirts and it seems to

me we are going to be spending our time determining whether the land is suitable for municipal expansion, based on the expression of somebody's view that at least tentatively or hypothetically there is some demand for that use of the land. I don't know whether I have answered your question -- the question you asked, or not, but at least it gave me an opportunity to answer another question.

You see, the process of classification is really just a matter of scope. Probably the greatest land classification made in the history of the universe -- I have to ask Mr. Hochmuth about this -- was the decision made that the land north of the Yukon line should not be available for state selection. What is that, a hundred million acres? Maybe it is 150 million acres of land. That land was classified by that particular process -- by that particular provision of the State Land Act. That's classification.

Now, if you want to talk about that kind of classification, you can do all kinds of classification. When the President, in the 1930's withdrew lands under the Taylor Grazing Act, that was a classification act -- or would that be right?

MR. HOCHMUTH: Yes.

MR. CARVER: Further classification finally gets down in a more and more refined basis until you finally get down to the point of whether or not this particular lot should or shouldn't go for (1), commercial use, or (2) a school or some other thing.

Again, I am turning to Hochmuth -- is that a fair statement of what classification consists of?

MR. HOCHMUTH: Or not go.

MR. CARVER: In action is classification. Within that broad term, you can say, of course, we are classifying. If you are talking about classification in the detail which is set forth in the Classification and Multiple Use Act, you are obviously talking about areas which have some unity or integrity for the particular use which is set forth.

For example, classifying lands as valuable for urban or industrial expansion -- you are not going to classify half a state like that, if you are going to be talking about 1,000 acres or 500 acres or 100 acres or somethinglike that. On the other hand, you could go into southern Oregon or southwestern Idaho and might classify 4,000 to 5,000 acres of chiefly valuable for grazing because you can't

think of any other use. But the term has no magic by itself. It just depnds -- it is just another word for the decision-making process in a given situation which is before you. We have been doing it all the time. The thing is, we haven't had our regulations and standards out there for the public to see, and that's what the Congress told us to get at and get at promptly.

QUESTION: Hasn't the Bureau in effect been classifying land, but time has a way of changing the classification of land? Isn't that true.

MR. CARVER: Well, classification can be permanent in one of several ways. At least it is moderately permanent when the Congress says so, because you say that continues until the Congress says something else. That's the situation north of the Yukon.

Another way that classification becomes permanent is, lets say, you classify for a given purpose and after it is applied for that purpose it can't be changed. You classify something for its gravel potential -- you take the gravel out -- and it may be changed after that, but at least -- for the time while operations are going on, it can't be changed. So there isn't anything permanent or final about it, either, as far as I am concerned. You are always dealing with a -- with the -- specific impact of some kind of pressure. It may be generalized and generated in our own offices, or it may be specific and generated in the office of some lawyer or some applicant, or it may be something in between as generated, lets say, by public petition that we ought to have such and such an area set apart for a park. That's a classification decision. Certain types of decisions, once they are made, don't back up very well. That is what you are fussing about. You see land which is classified for grazing use. You want to know, on that basis, are you safe in going out and making an investment and improving it or are you subject to having the thing overturned right away? That's the kind of indecision which Congress was trying to get at in the Classification Act.

JUDGE HUGHES: That worries us. When the Taylor Grazing Act was first passed and before there was a National Board or state board, most of us made up our minds that when the land was needed for a higher use than grazing, it could be taken for that higher use. As a principle, I think that is still true.

What Rea, if I understand it, was asking about -- the term -- the application of higher use -- a particular use may change.

I don't know how much credit we can give to the Communists who say by 1975 or 1980 we will be a "want" nation for food. Maybe they are right. Maybe they aren't. There is a population growth. There is a pretty general use of land.

On the construction of the Navajo Trail we are getting a big influx from California for summer homes. They spend a lot of time in the Telluride Mountain area. On the other hand we are getting more and more influx from east, over Highway 50 and to the north of the area I refer to. It is tremendous. A lot of them are bying homes there. If you are familiar with the geography, at Ouray in the last 15 or 18 months there have been 12 homes purchased by the residents of California coming in there for the summer.

If this is so, we will counsel with them as to the best way they use it. Our suggestion is President recognize there is no inconsistency between recreation from the standpoint of tourists and campgrounds and the raising of livestock, and if, during that period, that particular two month period, there becomes an inconsistency, the tourists are gone and the school takes it up -- we can graze after that period. It can be worked out. But you have to make a multiple purpose use insofar as recreation, tourists, summer homes and the raising of livestock and hold all the grazing we can for the reason for the period may be shorter than some of us think when agriculture will be on the preferred list.

MR. CARVER: Well, I think, Judge, you pointed the question up very well. I had occasion the other day to be discussing the question of agricultural development of lands presently committed to grazing use. Rea and others will recognize that they are in southern Idaho, and the supervening agricultural use by way of irrigated agriculture, even under entries which haven't yet gone to patent, is a totally displacing use. So then the question came up to me or was passed on to me -- saying -- they said, what happens if these people go broke? You got a speculative deal there and a lot of investment. After three or four years the land becomes less productive and the fuel costs for the pumping of the water up these heights goes up or the prices of products go down ot the point where they can't make it, then I was asked, what is the situation concerning those lands.?

Without really knowing much about it, I said, well, without the water the land has only one use. And it will immediately rever to range use, except that now it will have been plowed, cleared, having been in agriculture, so then the pressure will be upon somebody, either in the private sector or public sector, to get out and get it seeded with the kind of grasses which will support livestock. If they did that, of course, the kind of investment they made wouldn't

be justified by itself, but it would be tremendous forage, wouldn't it.

In other words, the land isn't ruined for this residual use without the application of water because the soil quality is still there.

I don't know that this really has any meaning to what I understand you have said. Under the Taylor Grazing Act principle, in effect, the livestock users were notified that when the country got so crowded that there wouldn't be any more range livestock use at that point, you would cheerfully take your medicine and get out of business and in the meantime you would like to be allowed, with a minimum of interference to continue on that basis. Is that what it amounts to? I guess that's about the way it has been happening so far. That's the genesis of the Taylor Act and what is worrying the Director and worrying some of the rest of us is the kind of situation you got there in Idaho where modern technology has, created this demand all of a sudden, to concern yourself with the plights of a range user who didn't really anticipate it was going to happen to him just then. He was in a position to amortize his investment over a couple of generations. All of a sudden he is out of business right there and then. The hazard -- the risk of this thing -- is a real one and one about which we have been concerned, and I guess that's the question before the house. I don't know the answer. But I do know that as you get into the situations of greater types of uses, that situations do come up that require something better than to say, well, that was the risk we took when we got into that.

QUESTION: Mr. Secretary, with regard to your talk a little bit ago, where you mentioned in the first part of your talk in regard to tenure, the land law review commission would probably study or come up with an analysis of tenure. Would you think that they would come up with an answer on tenure or would that come actually back through the Bureau to come up with what may be considered a proper stocking on ranges -- not stocking -- but tenure itself? Just the word "tenure" -- would that go to the Commission or back to the Bureau?

MR. CARVER: I don't think it is really definite that the intellectual idea of it would be one way or the other. Certainly, the Burea is going to be asked -- that is, the Department is going to be asked to come up with its ideas on every subject which comes up before the Commission. The Advisory Council members and the members of the Commission themselves are going to have their own ideas. The idea which is adopted is going to be adopted not on the basis of who had the idea, but on the general consensus of what is the best idea.

I have felt, and I still so feel, that an advisory board council as broadly represented as this one, if it should come up with a unit recommendation as to what would be a fair way of handling the question of tenure, would have a leg up on the recommendations of any other group, including the recommendations of the Government. Lets face it. There is a kind of anti-Government feeling, a lot of it well-deserved. I was talking about Congressional relations the other day with a group of representatives, young fellows who gathered together to talk about Government problems -- they gather together once a month -- there is somebody from the State Department, Commerce Department, CIA, Interior Department, Senate, from the House, and so on, and we just talked -- not at the policy level, but they weren't clerks, either. As I was talking to these people -- and they were talking about resource management -- the kind of thing you are concerned about here -- it became obvious to me that many of these people felt that it is sort of the duty of the Executive Branch to save the Congress from itself; that the Congress, left to its own devices would be profligate with our resources -- would give them away -- and wouldn't be wise with them. So it is up to the Executive Branch -- as they expressed it -- to make these decisions, and that's that.

That doesn't jibe with my own philosophy of government and I recognize it. I don't have this all by myself. I would say it is not completely shared.

My own philosophy of government tells me that if I can't have confidence in the law-making branch of my government, then I can't have confidence in the government itself. That is the essence of our government -- free elected legislators. Everybody makes mistakes. But you go to start out with the presumption, as I do, that you can legitimately place a policy issue such as the question of tenure before the Congress and have the Congress be fair about it; or that you can legitimately place before the Congress a question of what to do with oil shale, or place before Congress the question of how much the depletion allowance should be. Everybody wouldn't agree with what they did, but if you don't have confidence in the legislative powers that are there, and if you don't like the way they do it, you can elect different Congressmen rather than say that the Congress is a bunch of dunderheads -- then we are in bad shape.

Thenit occured to me that there is a direct ratio between a department's good relationships with the Congress and how they felt about the Congress. A department which respects the Congress, which believe in the Congress is likely to have better Congressional relations than a department which thinks Congress is a damn nuisance which they have to put up with.

They are likely to have bad relations with the Congress.

QUESTION: During the discussion of the Wilderness Bill, there were a great many public hearings over a period of six or seven years. During that same period of time, I don't know how many hundred's of thousands of acres of public lands were disposed of to the Indian tribes. As I recollect, there were few, if any, public hearings in connection with that. The question that I have, is it likely that Congress will provide for some kind of hearings before the public when large withdrawals or retentions or disposals of land are contemplated under these forthcoming laws?

MR. CARVER: I would say it is not only likely, but one thing you can count upon as absolutely certain. Any major disposition of lands, whether accomplished by the Congress or by the Executive Branch will be done in the future only after there has been full and complete hearings of some forthcoming law -- through some forum or other.

I can state with a good deal of confidence that this will be the case. Congress has provided that the principal source of this kind of withdrawals, which is for the multi-purpose type, can only be done if there are over 5,000 acres by an Act of Congress and the Department itself is operating under an agreement with Congress which as precisely the same effect as far as any withdrawal or disposition of land in large amounts such as you have referred to.

Now, as to the Congress itself acting, that is by exchange or the other ways to Indian reservations or other kinds of withdrawals, you have to go back to what I said. The hearing process in the Legislative Branch is a good one and, in the years I have been around Washington, I have not known very many situations where this thing takes place without the hearing process being pretty good.

REST-ROTATION IN GRAZING MANAGEMENT

Summary of talk by A. L. Hormay
To the National Advisory Board Council
Washington, D. C.
March 23, 1965

You all know there is no such thing as a cure-all. But I have one. I have a solution to the grazing management problems facing you on range lands. It is rest-rotation grazing.

Rest-rotation is a principle of management. It has application in many areas of wildland use -- in management of wildlife, watersheds, and recreation -- as well as in management of livestock grazing.

I would like to explain rest-rotation management so you may understand how it works. I want to illustrate its application in the management of range livestock grazing. Also, I want to show you color slides of results that have been obtained with rest-rotation grazing on a mountain cattle range in California.

To manage grazing effectively the objectives of management should be clearly in mind. The broad goals on both public and private ranges are the same--namely maximum sustained livestock production and maximum sustained forage production. These goals might be put in reverse order because the first need is forage.

Unfortunately, most western ranges are not producing as much forage as they once did nor as much as the soil is capable of producing at present. Heavy livestock grazing during early settlement of the West and through the period of World War I caused serious deterioration of the range and loss of livestock grazing capacity.

Many desirable forage plants, principally perennial grasses, were killed out and replaced by undesirable ones. Strikingly apparent now throughout the West is brush on grassland sites, thickened brush stands and many undesirable weeds. The vegetation cover, as a whole, has been thinned causing accelerated soil erosion, loss of soil fertility, excessive runoff, silting and flooding. It is estimated that livestock grazing capacity in 1936 was only about half of what it was in 1870 when livestock were first grazed in appreciable numbers on the western range.

(Slides of color photographs taken in California, Oregon, Utah, Montana, Colorado, Arizona, and New Mexico were shown to illustrate some range conditions in the West.)

One of the biggest problems confronting range livestock producers and range managers, generally, is rehabilitating the range - re-establishing desirable forage plants and increasing grazing capacity. The principal way this can be done is through proper management of grazing. Portions of the range can be improved by artificial reseeding, chemical spraying and other cultural practices, but the amount is small. Even on these areas proper grazing is needed to maintain the forage produced.

The range manager has but three ways of managing grazing, by regulating (1) stocking, (2) season of grazing, and (3) livestock distribution. Good or bad results in both forage and livestock production depend on how these three measures are applied.

To manage grazing properly one should understand why plants are killed by grazing. Unlike animals, plants make their own food. They use the food to build tissues and for energy to carry on life processes. In the case of perennial plants, some of the food is stored in the roots or stems of the plant and is used in the production of new growth the following and succeeding years. Most important range plants are perennials. Grazing during certain periods of the year interferes with both the production and storage of food and can result in the death of the plant.

The plant makes food from gases obtained from the atmosphere and water and mineral elements obtained from the soil. It combines these materials and forms carbohydrates, proteins and fats. It gets the energy to do this from sunlight. The energy is absorbed in the cells of the plant by a green pigment chlorophyll. Thus, the plant can make food only when it is green. Also, it can store food only at this time.

Most of the food is made in the leaves. If the plant crown is removed by grazing during the green period, the plant cannot make or store food. Repeated close use over a period of years at this time leads to exhaustion of food reserves and death of the plant. The plant is hurt most by grazing when it is growing rapidly -- in most plants just before flowering time. Food storage is largely completed by the time seed ripens. Grazing thereafter is not particularly harmful.

(Charts were used to illustrate plant growth and development, period of food production and storage and trend in food reserves during the year.)

The problem of grazing management arises from the fact the vegetation is most palatable and has highest grazing value at the very time it is hurt most by grazing. It is not practical to forego use of the vegetation at this time. It would mean sacrificing most of the weight gains made by livestock during the season. How to graze during this period and still improve the range is the problem.

Clipping studies with different forage species have shown that 40 to 60 or so percent of the plant crown can be removed during the green period without interfering appreciably with the growth of the plant. Safe or proper use levels have been established for many plants. However, because of the grazing habits of livestock and diverse nature of the range, proper use levels cannot be realized on the range.

Livestock graze the range selectively and unevenly. They graze different areas and different species of plants to different degrees. Areas around water and along accessible drainage ways and the more palatable forage species, for example, are invariably closely utilized. No manipulation of stocking, season of grazing, or livestock distribution can prevent this close use.

(Slides were shown illustrating selective, uneven use of range by livestock.)

The only way good forage plants can be maintained or increased on livestock concentration areas is to periodically rest the range from grazing so the plants can grow a full crown, make and store food and have opportunity to reproduce. The timing and duration of rest periods are dictated by the growth requirements of the vegetation.

To apply rest as needed requires cross-fencing the range into units or pastures -- usually three to five. Each year one or two units are rested from grazing yearlong while the others are grazed. Different units are grazed and rested from year to year in rotation.

Grazing and resting are applied to a range unit over time as follows: After a period of grazing -- a season or a year -- the unit is rested to restore the vigor and seed producing capacity of the plants. Usually one growing season is adequate. The unit is rested further to protect ripening seed from being grazed. Following seed fall, the unit is grazed to make use of the forage and to get seed trampled into the ground. Seed trampling is of paramount importance in getting reproduction under the deteriorated site conditions found on most ranges. The unit is then rested again for a year or two to insure establishment of seedlings. Thus, natural regeneration is effected and this is the key to all range improvement.

The grazing-resting sequence is applied to each range unit systematically so the entire range is rehabilitated. Such a sequence or grazing formula has to be developed for each individual range for no two ranges are alike.

Under rest-rotation grazing, artificial reseeding, chemical brush and weed control and other cultural practices can be applied in units without changing the grazing schedule, reducing stocking or constructing additional fences. Vegetation produced by cultural means is managed the same way as the untreated native vegetation.

In working out the grazing formula and planning the layout of pasture fences, special attention is given to minimizing or eliminating movement and handling of livestock during the green period. These measures reduce weight gains and are an expense.

Vegetation left in rested pastures should not be considered wasted. It is the means by which grazing capacity is restored. Furthermore, it constitutes a reserve that can be used in years of low forage production and in other emergencies. It provides litter to improve soil fertility and food and cover for wildlife. It improves the watershed.

Under rest-rotation management of livestock grazing all plants are provided opportunity to grow and reproduce -- not only livestock forage species but all plants. Therefore, since practically all wildland resource values stem directly or indirectly from vegetation, rest-rotation livestock grazing can be a dominant force in rehabilitation of the entire resource. Improvement can be effected

more rapidly under livestock grazing than under livestock exclusion primarily because of mass trampling and planting of seed by livestock. Also, livestock grazing produces other benefits than can be obtained no other way. So livestock grazing is desired and needed on wildlands.

It should be fully appreciated that resting is the rehabilitating force. Rest-rotation management consists of the timely application of rest -- rest from use. It is the key to the effective management of forage and other wildland resources.

(Slides of results obtained with rest-rotation grazing on the Harvey Valley cattle allotment, Lassen National Forest, northeastern California. Allotment statistics: vegetation -- sagebrush, meadow, pine; precipitation 18 inches, snowy winters, dry summers; range deterioration heavy, dense sagebrush, weeds, erosion widespread; key forage species -- Idaho fescue, Nevada bluegrass; grazing plan -- 5 units, 3 grazed, 2 rested each year; grazing season June 1 - September 30; rest-rotation grazing started 1952; limited acreage reseeded, sprayed.)

(Principal points in slides:

1. Vigor of plants on closely grazed and all other areas restored by rest.

2. Reproduction of desirable forage plants established in all types especially on closely grazed, heavily trampled areas.

3. One season of rest not enough for establishment of reproduction. Two growing seasons needed.

4. Vegetation, forage and grazing capacity increased on all areas even the most heavily grazed. Rehabilitation slow or negligible on heavily eroded sites and where brush and weeds thick.

5. Watershed cover improved. Sheet and gully erosion being controlled.

6. Wildlife habitat -- big game, waterfowl and other improved. Browses -- bitterbrush, aspen increased.

7. Vegetation established by artificial reseeding and spraying maintained.)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
NATIONAL ADVISORY BOARD COUNCIL
COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

Industry Use Committee

Bruce Anderson, Chairman
Colorado (oil and gas)

Ray Lincoln, Vice Chairman
Idaho (sheep)

Edward W. Clyde
Utah (petroleum)

W. Howard Gray
Nevada (mining)

M. V. Hatch
Utah (sheep)

Vard H. Heaton
Arizona (sheep)

Milton T. Jones
Idaho (cattle)

Paul G. Lose
Montana (sheep)

Doyal Stiles
Idaho (wildlife)

George N. Swallow
Nevada (sheep)

Public Use Committee

Brunel Christensen, Chairman
California (cattle)

Bruce Bowler, Vice Chairman
Idaho (outdoor recreation)

Arnold Bolle
Montana (forestry)

Theodore Conn
Oregon (wildlife)

Harold Evans
Wyoming (wildlife)

Arthur J. Harris
Alaska (state-wide)

Francis A. LeSourd
Washington (state-wide)

Joe Mendiburu
California (sheep)

Robert V. Thompson
Wyoming (cattle)

Resource Management Committee

Floyd W. Lee, Chairman
New Mexico (sheep)

Leonard Horn, Vice Chairman
Colorado (cattle)

Lee J. Esplin
Arizona (cattle)

Henry C. Gerber
Oregon (cattle)

Edwin S. Hofmann
Colorado (wildlife)

Othel L. Pay
Utah (cattle)

Eldon Smith
Montana (wildlife)

James S. Weber
Oregon (sheep)

James S. Whaley
Wyoming (soil conservation)

Community Affairs Committee

Gerhard N. Rostvold, Chairman
California (urban-suburban development)

George C. Ricca, Vice Chairman
Arizona (county government)

Joseph E. Donlin
Wyoming (sheep)

Kumen S. Gardner
Utah (cattle)

Leonard Hoskins
Nevada (wildlife)

Fred Strosnider
Nevada (cattle)

William A. Williams, Jr.
New Mexico (soil conservation)

Public Information and Education Committee

Lloyd Rea, Chairman
Oregon (county government)

Gene J. Etchart, Vice Chairman
Montana (cattle)

Murray Doyle
California (wildlife

F. Louis Hernandez
New Mexico (wildlife)

Max T. Layton
Arizona (wildlife)

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE NATIONAL ADVISORY BOARD COUNCIL
March 22-24, 1965

The National Advisory Board Council voted to adopt and submit to the Secretary of the Inteior for his consideration the following recommendations of the Public Use Committee:

1. That the States of Arizona, California, Idaho, and Wyoming be commended for enacting legislation dealing with private land owner liability involved in public recreation on private lands, and that the other Western States be urged to consider the enactment of similar legislation based on those acts and the model bill suggested for State enactment by the Council of State Governments.

2. That the Congress be requested to provide funds to repair and restore public ways and trails which have been damaged by flood or other causes and which are necessary for the administration of and access to the public lands.

The National Advisory Board Council voted to adopt and submit to the Secretary of the Interior for his consideration the following recommendations of the IndustryUse Committee:

1. That the Secretary of the Interior be given the authority to regulate future withdrawals of public lands as to time when the land will be restored to the public domain, to determine the acreage to be withdrawn, and to restrict the extent of the withdrawal so that uses not inconsistent with the purposes of the withdrawal can be continued, all to the end that the public lands will remain so far as possible available to multiple use; and, further, that the Secretary of the Interior be given the authority to restore to the public domain or to other consistent uses, vacant lands heretofore withdrawn unless the agency for which the land was withdrawn can show to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Interior a justification for a continuation of the withdrawal or the exclusion of other uses.

2. That the Council endorse the general proposal of the Bureau of Land Management for the issuance of a license or permit to conduct seismographic and geophysical exploration on the public domain.

3. In the consideration of user fees pertaining to oil and gas, minerals, and grazing, that due consideration be given to the following:

a. Effect upon the economy of the local and regional communities.

b. Economic health of the particular industry.

c. National need for the development of the resource.

d. Private investment dependent upon the resource, and private capital invested in the resource resulting in public benefit.

e. Need for independent studies in depth by the separate industries--such studies to be made by the several industries represented on the Council in time for the Secretary of the Interior to report by the fall, 1965, reporting date.

f. Values involved that transcend maximum onetary return to the government with emphasis on intrinsic value to the Nation other than financial return--investments in real estate and livestock due to reaons other than expectation of normal industry profits give a distorted picture of the true values of the livestock unit.

4. That the Bureau of Land Management require that a license or permit be obtained for weather modification on or over the public domain.

The National Advisory Board Council voted to adopt and submit to the Secretary of the Interior for his consideration the following recommendations of the Resource Management Committee:

1. That the Council endorse the statement read before it by Member Henry Gerber as the guideline to be followed for the release of exotic mammals on the public lands.

2. That a proposed special rule for issuing licenses or permits for grazing priveleges on lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management be adopted as follows:

   The District Manager is hereby authorized to issue grazing licenses or permits to those persons who own or control base properties which have been recognized for grazing priveleges even though some or all of the livestock may not be owned at the time by the applicants, provided, that the applicant in each case has certified in writing that he is and will be personally

responsible for the livestock and for full compliance with the grazing regulations, including substantial use of the base property, with regard to numbers and/or classes of livestock, period or periods and area or areas of use, and management plans applicable to the range area or allotment involved, provided, that no charge will be made for the use of the Federal range in excess of the current grazing fee of the Bureau of Land Management.

3. That the statement on subletting in Section 3E of BLM Instruction Memo No. 64-373 (to become a part of the BLM Manual for Grazing Administration inside Grazing Districts) be changed to read as follows:

   The licensee or permittee in many cases will not be the owner of all of the livestock. He may have purchased the livestock on contract of sale basis, he may be running the livestock on a calf crop sharing or percent of gain basis, cash basis, or other basis. Such arrangements are permissible, provided the licensee or permittee is in the livestock business, and he has direct control over the management of the livestock, and the livestock make substantial use of the base property as part of a year-round operation.

4. That the Bureau of Land Management give adequate attention to the problem of access to public lands, especially in regard to any disposition action.

5. That the Bureau of Land Management issue a policy statement to its field offices which permits consideration of the particular class of livestock, such as yearlings, in determining the stocking rate for a particular range area.

The National Advisory Board Council voted to adopt and submit to the Secretary of the Interior for his consideration the following recommendations of the Community Affairs Committee:

1. That the name of the Committee be changed to the Community and Intergovernmental Affairs Committee, as a reflection of the working relationships of the Bureau of Land Management with various units of government under the new legislation.

2. That, because the Bureau of Land Management will be working closely with the lower units of government in implementing the Public Sale Act and because there are currently seven prototype studies underway, current cooperations between State, county, city, and otherpolitical subdivisions and the Bureau of Land Management be continued.

3. That the language of section 2410.1-3(b) and similar following sections of the regulations and criteria proposed for the implementation of the Public Land Sales Act and the Classification and Multiple Use Act be changed to conform with section 2243.2-1(b) of those regulations and criteria which provides for the disposal of lands by transfer to communities in the absence of master plans so long as adequate zoning regulations exist and disposal would be consistent with the objectives of the local governments involved.

4. That the Bureau of Land Management move rapidly in the classification of lands; in this way the Bureau will be best able to participate with groups, organizations, and agencies in programs such as soil and water conservation districts, small watershed projects, resource improvement projects, resource conservation and development projects, community action programs (CAP 9, Office of Economic Development), Job Corps Camps, and Title 1, parts B and C, of the Economic Opportunity Act, under coordinated procedures for the protection, development, and utilization of public land natural resources.

The National Advisory Board Council voted to adopt and submit to the Secretary of the Interior for his consideration the following recommendations of the Public Information and Education Committee:

1. That the Department of the Interior explore means of producing for public education motion pictures depicting balanced multiple use management of lands.

2. That, in reaffirmation of the recommendation of the Council in 1964, the Department of the Interior arrange for a speaker at every possible convention of organizations interested in the management of resources whereat the problems of resource management in the West can be presented.

3. That the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Land Management be commended for their efforts at placing natural resource management materials in the public schools; and that the Department of Interior use every means available to further provide educational material on the subject of resource management in all schools.

4. That the Bureau of Land Management exercise initiative, leadership, and coordination in promoting harmony and understanding between all resource user groups.

5. That the Council commend the Bureau of Land Management and Director Charles H. Stoddard for the Bureau's attention to and compliance with recommendations of the Council over the past year and the cooperative attitude shown during the present meeting.

The National Advisory Board Council voted to adopt and submit to the Secretary of the Interior for his consideration the following general resolution:

1. That the Council appreciates the opportunity to discuss with the Bureau of Land Management the proposed criteria to be followed in classification of lands under the multiple use and public sales acts, and although one specific recommendation has been adopted upon the report of the Community Affairs Committee, the Council does not at this time desire to take formal action in regard to the proposed criteria but refers the Bureau of Land Management to the detailed discussion with the Council during the session held in regard thereto.

GPO 891-698

BLM Library
Denver Federal Center
Bldg. 85, OC-521
P.O. Box 25047
Denver, CO 80225